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LAW AUTHORIZING THIS PUBLICATION

(Section 347, Lord's Oregon Laws, as amended by Chapter 359, General Laws of Oregon, 1913)

MEASURES AND ARGUMENTS TO BE PRINTED AND DISTRIBUTED

Not later than the ninetieth day before any regular general election, at which any constitutional amendment to the constitution is to be submitted, the Secretary of State shall cause to be printed in pamphlet form a true copy of the title and text of each measure to be submitted, with the number and form in which the ballot title thereof will be printed on the official ballot. The person, committee or duly organized officers of any organization filing any petition for the initiative, but no other person or organization, shall have the right to file with the Secretary of State for printing and distribution any argument advocating such measure; said argument shall be filed not later than the one hundred and fifteenth day before the regular election at which the measure is to be voted upon. Any person, committee or organization may file with the Secretary of State, for printing and distribution, any arguments they may desire, opposing any measure, not later than the one hundred and fifth day immediately preceding such election. Arguments advocating or opposing any measure referred to the people by the Legislative Assembly, or by referendum petition, at a regular general election, shall be governed by the same rules as to time, but may be filed with the Secretary of State by any person, committee or organization. But in every case the person or persons offering such arguments for printing and distribution shall pay to the Secretary of State sufficient money to pay all the expenses for paper and printing to supply one copy with every copy of the measure to be printed by the State; and he shall forthwith notify the person offering the same of the amount of money necessary. The Secretary of State shall cause one copy of each of said arguments to be bound in the pamphlet copy of the measures to be submitted as herein provided, and all such measures and arguments to be submitted at one election shall be bound together in a single pamphlet. All the printing shall be done by the State, and the pages of said pamphlet shall be numbered consecutively from one to the end. The pages of said pamphlet shall be six by nine inches in size and the printed matter therein shall be set in six-point Roman-faced solid type on not to exceed seven-point body, in two columns of thirteen ems in width each to the page with six-point dividing rule and with appropriate heads and printed on a good quality of book paper twenty-five by thirty-eight inches weighing not more than fifty pounds to the ream. The title page of every measure bound in said pamphlet shall show the ballot title and ballot number. The title page of each argument shall show the measure or measures it favors or opposes and by what persons or organization it is issued. When such arguments are printed he shall pay the State Printer therefrom the money deposited with him and refund the surplus, if any, to the parties who paid it to him. The cost of printing, binding and distributing the measures proposed and of binding and distributing the arguments, shall be paid by the State as a part of the State printing. It being intended that only the cost of paper and printing the arguments shall be paid by the parties presenting the same, and they shall not be charged any higher rate for such work than is paid by the State for similar work and paper. Not later than the fifty-fifth day before the regular general election at which such measures are to be voted upon the Secretary of State shall transmit, by mail, with postage fully prepaid, to every voter in the State whose address he may have, one copy of each pamphlet.

NOTE—For the convenience of the voters, a list of the official ballot titles and numbers of the Proposed Constitutional Amendments and Measures is printed on pages 47 and 48 of this pamphlet. This list is intended for their use, if desired, in preparing marked lists in advance in order to aid them in the final marking of their ballots at the polls.

Secretary of State
AN AMENDMENT

To the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, to amend Section 15, of Article V, proposed by the Legislative Assembly under Amended Senate Joint Resolution No. 12, filed in the office of the Secretary of State, February 1, 1915.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed amendment will be printed on the official ballot:

Constitutional Amendment—Referred to People by the Legislative Assembly

Submitted by the Legislature.—SINGLE ITEM VETO AMENDMENT—An amendment to Section 15 of Article V of the Constitution of the State of Oregon authorizing the Governor to veto single items in appropriation bills.

Vote YES or NO.

300 Yes.

301 No.

AMENDED SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives, jointly concurring:

That Section 15 of Article V of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, shall be and hereby is amended so as to read as follows:

ARTICLE V

Section 15. (a) The Governor shall have power to veto single items in appropriation bills.

Section 15. (b) Every bill which shall have passed the Legislative Assembly shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the Governor; if he approve, he shall sign it; but if not, he shall return it with his objections to that house in which it shall have originated, which house shall enter the objections at large upon the journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such reconsideration 'two-thirds' of the members present shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other house, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of the members present it shall become a law. But in all such cases the votes of both houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the members voting for or against the bill shall be entered on the journal of each house respectively; if any bill shall not be returned by the Governor within five days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, it shall, be a law without his signature, unless the general adjournment shall prevent its return, in which case it shall be a law, unless the Governor within five days next after the adjournment (Sundays excepted) shall file such bill, with his objections thereto, in the office of the Secretary of State, who shall lay the same before the Legislative Assembly at its next session in like manner as if it had been returned by the Governor.

That a joint Legislative Committee, two from the Senate and three from the House, be appointed by the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House respectively, to prepare and file an argument in behalf of this proposed amendment in the official pamphlet, and the Secretary of State is directed to furnish said Committee with the necessary printing and space. In said pamphlet.

For affirmative argument see page 4.
Submitted by the Legislative Committee, advocating Single Item Veto Amendment.

The single item veto as a means for economy in State government should have been adopted a long time ago. Both of the leading candidates for Governor at the last election declared in favor of it and there is no argument to the contrary.

So long as the Governor has the veto power he should have the power to veto each item in appropriation bills. It is the practice of the Legislature to rush through blanket appropriation bills in the last days of the session covering many items and totaling sometimes hundreds of thousands of dollars. Many of the features of these bills are meritorious, in fact necessary, for the administration of the State government, but included with these items are often placed undesirable items which could not, standing alone, be passed. It is to stop this practice and reach these undesirable items that the single item veto is desired.

As the situation now is, the Governor must either veto the whole of the general appropriation bills and thus cause disruption of the State's business affairs, or shut his eyes to the bad items and let them pass with the good. So long as the Governor has the veto power it should be made comprehensive. If this amendment carries it will be possible for the Governor to pick out of any appropriation bill any special item and veto it.

The Governor has the full power to veto single items in appropriation bills in many other states and we should give him the power in Oregon. Legislatures are often inclined to extravagance through log-rolling and trading, and the veto power in the Governor’s hands furnishes the best check on that practice.

DAN KELLAHER,
State Senator.

SAM’L M. GARLAND,
State Senator.

Committee appointed by the President of the State Senate of Oregon.

Filed June 1, 1916.

To the Voters of Oregon:

The 1915 session of the Legislature submitted to the voters of Oregon a proposed amendment to the Constitution which proposed amendment provided for: “The Governor shall have power to veto single items in appropriation bills.” Under the provisions of the joint resolution submitting the amendment, House and Senate Committees to prepare arguments why the amendment should be adopted were appointed. Among others the undersigned were appointed members of the Committee.

In the Oregon Daily Journal of Friday, June 2, 1916, among other things appeared the following, touching the subject under consideration:

“REASON FOR THE AMENDMENT

“The long followed legislative practice of tucking needless and extravagant appropriation items into the general appropriation bill has given rise to the movement for the amendment. As the Constitution now stands, the Governor has the power to veto an entire bill, but not a single part or item. In the 1913 session the general appropriation bills carrying appropriations of $9,000,000 were still in committee nine days before the adjournment of the Legislature, and were not reported out and passed until the last day before adjournment.

“These bills carried all the money voted for the maintenance of the State government, and it was impossible for the Governor to disapprove the bills without holding up this maintenance money for two years, or calling a special session for the sole purpose of considering his veto.

“For years those fighting against enormous appropriations have contended against this practice. Efforts have been made to split the appropriation bills into segments, so that useless appropriations could be reached by the Legislature, or the Governor, without endangering or defeating necessary and legitimate State expenditures, but with little success.”

As the foregoing practically covers the subject, we submit the same as our argument without further comment.

Respectfully submitted,

W. W. CARDWELL,
D. C. LEWIS.

Committee appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, State of Oregon.

Filed June 22, 1916.
AN AMENDMENT

To the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, to amend Article IX by adding thereto an additional section to be numbered Section 1 (b), proposed by the Legislative Assembly under Senate Joint Resolution No. 18, filed in the office of the Secretary of State, February 12, 1915.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed amendment will be printed on the official ballot:

Constitutional Amendment—Referred to People by the Legislative Assembly

Submitted by the Legislature.—SHIP TAX EXEMPTION AMENDMENT—An amendment to Article IX of the Constitution of the State of Oregon exempting from taxation until January 1st, 1935, except taxes for State purposes only, all ships and vessels of fifty tons or more capacity, engaged in either passenger or freight coasting or foreign trade, whose home ports of registration are in the State of Oregon, for the purpose of encouraging registration of such vessels in Oregon, which would otherwise register in other States. Vote YES or NO.

302 Yes.
303 No.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 18

Be it Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon, the House of Representatives jointly concurring:

That Article IX of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, be and the same is hereby amended, by adding thereto an additional section to be numbered Section 1 (b) of Article IX, and which shall read as follows:

Section 1. (b) All ships and vessels of fifty tons or more capacity engaged in either passenger or freight coasting or foreign trade, whose home ports of registration are in the State of Oregon, shall be and are hereby exempted from all taxes of every kind whatsoever, excepting taxes for State purposes, until the first day of January, 1935.

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he is hereby authorized and directed to set aside one page in the official pamphlet containing initiative and referendum measures to be voted upon in the year 1916, in which arguments supporting this proposed amendment may be printed; and be it further

Resolved, That a committee of one Senator and two Representatives be appointed to prepare and file with the Secretary of State arguments in support of this amendment.
AN AMENDMENT

To the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, to repeal Section 6, of Article II, proposed by the Legislative Assembly under Senate Joint Resolution No. 22, filed in the office of the Secretary of State, February 20, 1915.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed amendment will be printed on the official ballot:

Constitutional Amendment—Referred to People by the Legislative Assembly

Submitted by the Legislature.—NEGRO AND MULATTO SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT—An amendment to the Constitution of the State of Oregon, removing the discrimination against negro and mulatto citizens by repealing Section 6 of Article II thereof, which section reads as follows: "No negro, Chinaman or mulatto shall have the right of suffrage."

Vote YES or NO.

304 Yes.
305 No.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 22

Joint Resolution for Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection at the Regular General Election in November, 1916;

Be it Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate jointly concurring:

That Section 6 of Article II of the Constitution of the State of Oregon be and the same is hereby repealed.
AN AMENDMENT

To the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, to amend Section 1, of Article I, proposed by initiative petition filed in the office of the Secretary of State, July 6, 1916.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed amendment will be printed on the official ballot:

Constitutional Amendment—Proposed by Initiative Petition

Initiated by Oregon State Federation of Labor, T. H. Burchard, President; E. J. Stack, Secretary, 302 Oregonian Building, Portland, Oregon; and the Central Labor Council of Portland and Vicinity, Eugene E. Smith, President; A. W. Jones, Vice-President; E. J. Stack, Secretary, 162 1/2 Second Street, Portland, Oregon.

FULL RENTAL VALUE LAND TAX AND HOMEMAKERS' LOAN FUND AMENDMENT—Purpose—A constitutional amendment declaring and defining (a) people's power and right; (b) citizen's right to use of land; (c) public ownership of land rent; (d) public policy of Oregon; defining (e) the word "land"; (f) method of appraising land rent; (g) land improvement; providing for (h) levy of permanent land rent tax; (i) publication of assessment; (j) delinquent tax sale; (k) maintenance of private property rights; (l) separate assessment of land rent; (m) standing timber; (n) assessment and collection of tax; (o) duty of Governor and State Land Board; (p) how personal property and land improvements may be taxed by vote of people only; (q) distribution of revenue from land rent tax; and (r) establishing homemakers' loan fund.

vote YES or No.

306 Yes.

307 No.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Section 1 of Article I of the Constitution of Oregon, being the Bill of Rights, shall be and hereby is amended to read as follows:

BILL OF RIGHTS

ARTICLE I

PEOPLE'S POWER AND RIGHTS

Section 1. (a) We declare that all citizens have equal rights; that all power is inherent in the people, and all just governments are founded on their consent and instituted for their peace, safety, prosperity and happiness; that they have at all times a right to alter, reform, or totally change the government, when a majority of those voting believe they can thereby promote the general welfare.

(b) We reaffirm our faith in the self-evident truths of the Declaration of Independence: "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

(c) Public ownership of all land rent is right, because such rent is created by the presence, industry and productive power of the whole people. Private ownership of land rent is the chief cause of land monopoly, land speculation and economic oppression. It is therefore right and necessary, in or-
order to promote the general welfare, that all land rent shall be collected by public taxation, whether the land is actually used or not.

**PUBLIC POLICY**

(d) It is the public policy of Oregon:

First: To abolish all forms of land monopoly so as to prevent any person from getting a profit by owning land without using it.

Second: To abolish involuntary unemployment and poverty in this state by enacting such laws as shall insure to all citizens opportunity for the exclusive possession and use of enough land to employ themselves and make their homes.

Third: To protect all persons in the absolute ownership of the value of their land improvements and the income therefrom.

**DEFINITION OF THE WORD “LAND”**

(e) For purposes of assessment and taxation appraisement, the word “land” means the earth, including soil, water, water power, minerals, stone, natural oils, gases, timber of natural growth, and all other natural resources before being severed, removed, or withdrawn from their natural position.

**DEFINITION AND METHOD OF APPRAISING LAND RENT**

(f) The words “land rent” as used in this section mean the fair and just price per year, as appraised by public officers, that a renter should pay for the use of any lot, tract, parcel or quantity of land on a lease which includes the following conditions:

First: That the renter has a five-year lease with the perpetual right to renew his lease at the end of each five-year term.

Second: That the rent shall be appraised and re-adjusted every fifth year, when the lease is renewed for the next five years, and that “land rent” shall not include any charge for the use of land improvements.

Third: That there shall be no increase of the “land rent” because of additional improvements and betterments made on, in or under the land.

Fourth: That the appraised land rent shall be paid to the public tax collector.

Fifth: That there shall be no tax or other charge to be paid by the renter for the use of the land except the appraised “land rent” and there shall be no tax on the market value of the land, except as hereinafter provided in paragraph (h) of this section.

**DEFINITION OF LAND IMPROVEMENT**

(g) The words “land improvements” mean buildings, clearings, ditches, drains, orchard trees, vines, crops of all kinds, fences and all other useful and ornamental changes, growths and additions made by labor and capital in or to any natural resources, or on, in or under any lot, tract, or parcel of land.

**LEVY OF PERMANENT LAND RENT TAX**

(h) During the year 1917, the State Land Board shall cause the County Assessors and State Tax Commission to appraise the annual land rent price of every lot, tract, parcel and quantity of land on the land rent tax roll set forth in paragraph (f) of this section, except land owned by the National, State and Local Governments. The State Land Board is hereon granted full authority to manage, control and dispose of the same, and to employ such expert assistance as the Board may consider necessary and to expend from the general fund of the State Treasury the sum necessary for that purpose. Such appraisement shall be made again in the year 1922 and every fifth year thereafter.

Beginning on the first day of January, 1917, all the appraised land rent of the land of Oregon (except such land as is now exempt by law from tax), shall be collected as a public tax in such manner as may be provided by the rules to be made by the State Land Board; provided, that the above rule shall be contrary to the provisions of any lettered paragraph of this section, nor contrary to general laws for that purpose that may be hereafter enacted by vote of the people. The land rent tax shall be paid whether the land is actually used or not. This section shall not prevent the collection of taxes levied in 1917, for the year 1916, or any previous assessment. After the making of the above tax levy for 1916, no other or further tax shall be levied on the market value of land, and the above land rent tax shall thereafter be the only tax on the ownership or use of land in Oregon.

**PUBLICATION OF ASSESSMENTS**

(i) The State Land Board shall provide every fifth year, when the land rent appraisement is made, for publication and distribution to every taxpayer a copy of the assessment and tax roll for the county in which he owns property, or for any subdivision thereof including his property, as the Board may deem necessary. In such published rolls the names of owners shall be alphabetically arranged and under each owner's name shall be listed all the land rents and other property for which he is assessed in that county or subdivision.

**DELINQUENT TAX SALES**

(j) The State Land Board shall bid the amount of delinquent tax and land rent taxes, with penalties and costs, but no more, on any land offered for sale at delinquent tax sales. The title to all land which may be sold to the State for said delinquent taxes shall vest absolutely in the State at the expiration of two years from the date of sale, if the land is not sooner redeemed. The title and ownership of improvements on, in or under any land sold for taxes shall not be acquired by the State or any other purchaser on such sale, unless the improvements are also sold for
a tax levied on the improvements. The state shall rent its land by leases, including the conditions of paragraph (f), with such other conditions, covenants, and agreements as the State Land Board may order. The State shall not sell any land.

(k) If any person's land rent tax, payable in one county, exceeds twelve dollars per year, such tax shall be paid in equal monthly, quarterly or semi-annual installments, as may be provided by law, or by the rules of the State Land Board. Failure to pay any installment of land rent tax when due shall render such tax delinquent and immediately subject to such penalties and process for collection as may be provided by law or by the rules of the State Land Board.

RIGHTS OF PRIVATE PROPERTY MAINTAINED

(1) One purpose of this section is to restore public ownership of land rent, but it does not change, limit or abolish any person's right of private property and exclusive possession of land and land leases, as long as the land rent tax is paid.

SEPARATE ASSESSMENT OF LAND RENT

(m) The amount of yearly land rent tax of every lot, tract, parcel and quantity of land shall be listed in the assessment and tax rolls separately from other taxes and from the assessed value of any personal property, and separately from the taxes and assessed value of any improvements on, in or under such land.

STANDING TIMBER

(n) Standing timber of natural growth shall be assessed and taxed as a part of the land on which it grows.

ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION OF TAX

(o) The laws in operation for assessing property and levying and collecting taxes and duties upon improvements when this section is adopted shall continue in force, and shall be applied to the collection of the tax hereby levied on land rent, except as herein provided, and as such laws may be changed by amendments and rules made hereafter in accordance with this section.

DUTY OF GOVERNOR

(p) It is the duty of the governor to enforce all the provisions of this section and all the laws for its application and the rules of the state land board. For that purpose the governor may remove any members of the state tax commission and any assessor or appraising officer for incompetency, failure, neglect or refusal to do their duty as prescribed by this section, or by the laws or the rules of the State Land Board, and shall appoint their successors in office for their unexpired terms.

DUTIES OF THE STATE LAND BOARD

(q) The governor, secretary of state and state treasurer constitute the State Land Board. Any two of the members constitute a quorum to do business.

The duties of the board are:

First: To make promulgate and publish all rules expedient to apply and enforce the provisions of this section not in conflict herewith.

Second: To prescribe all forms and blanks for use under this section.

Third: To provide for making all loans as safe and secure as practicable, and to require insurance of all perishable land improvements and other security taken for the repayment of loans.

Fourth: To provide methods of appeal, for any person interested, from the decision of a local appraiser who recommends approval or rejection of an application for a loan.

Fifth: To make its forms, blanks and rules so plain that there will be no need for an applicant to employ a lawyer in preparing or presenting his application for a loan. Every such rule made by the board shall have the force and effect of law until it is changed or repealed by a general act or law adopted by vote of the people at a regular general election. No such measure shall be submitted to the people at a special election.

SPECIAL TAXES ON PERSONAL PROPERTY AND LAND IMPROVEMENTS

(r) A special tax may be levied on personal property and land improvements in any year, for local purposes only, by school and road districts, towns, cities and counties. Every such levy shall be proposed by the usual form of initiative petition and shall be made only if it is approved by a majority of those voting on the question. All initiative petitions proposing such tax levies shall be legally filed with the county clerk not later than the first Monday in September and shall be submitted to the people for approval or rejection at the election to be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November next after the filing of such petitions. The question as to each proposed special tax levy applies, Special elections for that purpose may be ordered when there is no general election to be held on said first Tuesday, and in all cases the vote shall be taken at all the regular polling places. The laws governing special and regular general elections in the submission of measures shall apply to such special tax levy elections. Every person qualified to vote for governor of the state shall be entitled to vote at any such tax election.

DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE FROM LAND RENT TAX

(s) Two-thirds of the revenue obtained in each county from the land rent tax levied in that county shall be divided among the different towns, cities, ports and all other municipalities in the county, and between that county and the state, by allowing and paying to each the same proportion of
this two-thirds that each received from the general tax levy of 1915. The above distribution of two-thirds of the revenue from said land rent tax may be changed from time to time by law.

HOME MAKERS' LOAN FUND

(t) The "Home Makers' Loan Fund" is hereby established in the state treasury. One-third of all revenue hereafter obtained from the present inheritance tax rate, shall be deposited in the state treasury to the credit of that account. The amount of this fund may be increased in any manner and from any source that is now or may be hereafter provided or levied by law, first approved by vote of the people. This fund shall be administered by the state land board. This fund shall be loaned to home makers, both in town and country, in amounts not exceeding two-thirds of the actual value of the land improvements they may make or have already made, on any lot or tract of land. Payment to the borrower of portions of such loan may be made at definite periods to be fixed by the board, as such improvements may progress. Every such loan shall be the first lien on the land and improvements, except taxes, and every such home and improvements shall be exempt from execution. Any member of that family, any lot or tract of land, Payment to the state treasurer to be estimated by the state land board, as such improvements may hereafter be made at definite periods to be fixed by the board, as such improvements may progress. Every such loan shall be the first lien on the land and improvements, except taxes, and every such home and improvements shall be exempt from execution.

One purpose of this section is to help persons with no capital but their labor and character to make homes and farms, but not more than $1,500 shall be loaned for the making of one such home or farm. The board may limit the amount of such loan that any person may draw in any year. This fund is for loan to those who may now trying to develop farms and make homes as well as to persons who begin hereafter.

If the sum total of all the property owned by any family shall exceed twenty-two hundred and fifty dollars in value, then no part of such fund shall be loaned to any member of that family.

COST, INTEREST AND TIME OF REPAYMENT

(u) The average actual cost of making, securing and administering said loans shall be estimated by the state land board, and a percentage sufficient to cover the same shall be deducted from every loan charged to the borrower as the same is advanced to him. The loans shall be secured by first mortgage on the improvements and the land. There shall be no interest on any such loan for the first five years, and thereafter the rate of interest shall not be greater than six per cent per annum. Every such loan may be made repayable by installments, but the final payment shall not in any case be more than twenty years from the date of the loan, unless such limitation shall be extended by law.

FORM AND PAYMENT OF STATE WARRANTS ON HOME MAKERS' LOAN FUND

(v) The warrants drawn on the state treasury for said Home Makers' Loan Fund shall be designated as such; they shall be payable on demand in lawful money of the United States of America, shall not bear interest, and shall be at all times receivable by all tax collectors at their face value for one-third of all land rent taxes, and shall at all times be receivable by the state treasurer in payment of all amounts due the state for such Loan Fund account. Said warrants shall be issued in denominations of one dollar, two dollars, five dollars, ten dollars and twenty dollars. Every such warrant, when received by the state treasurer, shall be cancelled and shall not be reissued. Such warrants shall be preserved for five years after being cancelled. The total amount of such Loan Fund warrants outstanding at one time shall never exceed two years income of said Loan Account as estimated by the State Land Board.

SELF-EXECUTING

(w) This section is self-executing in all its provisions and paragraphs, and shall take effect and be in operation as to all assessments made after the first day of January next after its approval and adoption by the people of Oregon. The provisions of this section do not apply to any assessments or taxes made or levied before the first day of March next after its approval by the people. All provisions of this section relating to the Home Makers' Loan Fund become operative and effective on the first day of December next after approval of this section by the people.

(x) All provisions of the Constitution and laws of Oregon in conflict with this section or any part hereof, are hereby repealed in so far as they conflict herewith. Any lettered paragraph of this section may be amended without resubmitting the entire section.

For affirmative argument see pages 11-14.
For negative arguments see pages 15-22.
ARGUMENT (Affirmative)

Submitted by the Oregon State Federation of Labor and the Central Labor Council of Portland and Vicinity, in behalf of Full Rental Value Land Tax and Homemakers' Loan Fund Amendment.

The committee appointed by the Central Labor Council of Portland and Vicinity to investigate and report a legislative remedy for unemployment, spent more than a year in study of the subject, and preparation of the People's Land and Loan Law amendment to the Constitution of Oregon.

The Committee reported unanimously that land speculation, the holding of land out of use and the taking of community made values by individuals are the direct and principal causes of poverty and unemployment.

As a permanent remedy the Committee recommended that this law be submitted by initiative petition and adopted by the people of Oregon to free the land and abolish the evils of land speculation.

The members of the Committee were E. J. Stack, of the State Federation of Labor; Eugene E. Smith of the Central Labor Council; Wm. MacKenzie, Steam Engineers No. 87; Frank Hagen, Bridge Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers; G. W. Stanly, Carpenters No. 808; J. J. Solhaug, Electrical Workers' No. 125; C. H. Kelly, Barbers' Union No. 75; A. W. Jones, Cigarmakers No. 202; H. Larson, Longshoremens No. 6; Peter Anderson, Carpenters' No. 50.

The committee's report was adopted by the Central Labor Council and approved by the Oregon State Federation of Labor.

The principal provisions of the law are as follows:

The law takes all land rent values for public taxes whether the land is used or not.

It provides for farmers and other home builders a system of rural and city credits by State loans.

It guarantees to every person perpetual and exclusive possession of his land as long as he pays the land rent tax. It also protects the private ownership of personal property and land improvements.

This law differs from the so-called single tax, only in that it does not prohibit inheritance, income or license taxes, and it does permit the levy of a special tax on personal property and land improvements, for local purposes only, by initiative petition when approved by the people of the taxing district.

It is often said that the possession of land is of no use to men without capital. This law will help such men and women to use the land and make homes, because it provides that the State will lend them two-thirds of the value of their improvements as they are made, both in town and country. This loan may be as much as $1,500.00 to one person for the first five years and not more than six per cent for the next fifteen years.

This law provides the only system of rural and city credit ever proposed which does not require a bond issue. The money for the loans to home makers will be taken from the land rent tax.

Poverty, unemployment, child labor, and all attendant evils can be ended by an intelligent vote. The Oregon State Federation of Labor and the Central Labor Council of Portland invite the closest study of the People's Land and Loan Law.

As additional argument for the adoption of this Law and Loan Law, the undersigned Organizations respectfully ask careful consideration of the reasons set forth in the following letters and quotations from letters commending the measure, received from Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor; C. B. Kellogg, Master of the Washington State Grange; Frank Walsh, the chairman of the famous Industrial Relations Commission; Mary Fels and Daniel Kleifer, of the Fels Fund Commission, and from many well known citizens of Oregon.

"Mr. E. J. Stack,
"Secretary Oregon State Federation of Labor.

"Dear Sir and Brother:

"It gives me pleasure to advise you that the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, at its last meeting, January 23, 1916, endorsed the Initiative Petition for the People's Land and Loan Amendment to the Constitution of Oregon.

"It is our hope that this splendid measure may be overwhelmingly approved by the citizens of Oregon at the coming election. If the people of Oregon take proper advantage of this opportunity, they will insure to every citizen the right and chance to use vacant State land by paying the land rent tax, which is an equitable method of taxation and a most practical plan for raising public revenues.

"The proposed People's Land and Loan Law, when put into practice will afford the self-reliant, self-respecting working people of your State a ready opportunity to employ themselves. Further, it will restore natural opportunities for all the people to avail themselves of the chance which the proposed plan offers by loans from the State treasury. Such loans will be, in actual practice, first class investments by the State for its most industrious and independent workers.

"Approval by the people of your State for this progressive measure will restore to the people that which in reality belongs to the people.

"With best wishes for your success,

(Signed) "SAM'L GOMPERS,
"President American Federation of Labor."
served poverty on one hand and undeserved wealth on the other.

Apart from any improvements, is a step toward the automatic destruction of private monopoly in land, so true relative economic equality will be automatically produced by a system which permits a monopoly of land holding which permits a monopoly of industry for their rewards of acreage and corner lots. Their heirs gave nothing; industry for their rewards of acreage and corner lots. Their heirs gave nothing; government loans money to set-...
some other persons who own the factory
and farm land that these producers use to
make my groceries.

"And when all have taken tribute from
my dollar, about sixty-five cents of It has
gone for service of many kinds and about
thirty-five cents to landlords for land rent
alone.

"I shall vote for the People's Land and
Loan bill because I believe it will help me
to get more for my dollar; will get more
taxes most of what they have been getting
out of my labor and will make the land­
lord and land speculator in Oregon work
for a living."

"M. J. BROWN,
"Editor Benton County Courier."

"Every man has a natural right to make
and own a job for himself. No man can
do this without possession of land. No
man can be free without the legal right to
exclusive and permanent possession of land.

"Adoption of the People's Land and
Loan Law will insure every citizen's right
to possession of land he uses by restoring
public ownership of the rental value of all
land, separate from the value of
improvements. This law will abolish
land speculation by making it forever
unprofitable.

"All history proves that political liberty
cannot be long maintained without this
legal right of every citizen to the possess­
ion of land, free from landlords, and that
it cannot be maintained by any provision
when every man owns possession of the
land he uses. The Fels Fund Commission
is organized and maintained to help Amer­
icans obtain their natural right to use
American land.

"DANIEL KIEFER, Chairman,
"The Joseph Fels Fund of America."

"This measure should meet with the
approval of the people of Oregon because
it will remove from the problem of secur­
ing a home, and of retaining it when se­
cured, not only the idle forestaller and
land speculator but the usurer as well.
To that principle only one thing has been
applied anywhere in the world benefits
to home and farm owners have been in
proportion.

"The provision made for not only rural
credit, but credit in city and town as well,
eliminates the bond buyer and bond
speculator.

"Uncle Jeff Snow says: 'A chap who
don't have to work because he owns a lot of
timber land and city business lots, was
telling meother day that this People's
Land and Loan Law wouldn't work; but I
told him I knew it would work, and when the
people vote for it he would have to work, too.

"Lots of people sit up nights worrying
over the loss of something that they never
had and are not going to get, like big
prices for vacant land.

"There are lots of things in this world
that don't seem much use, like worms in
wood and land speculators in Oregon.'

"ALFRED D. CRIDGE."

"Attention of farmers and all farm
working men and women is directed to
the recent action of the Washington State
Grange and to quote the following para­
graphs from a letter by State Master C. B.
Regley to W. G. Reichert, of Elm Branch
Grange No. 2128, Harrisonville, Mo.:

"Dear Sir and Brother: The exact
wording of the tax resolution as adopted
by the Washington State Grange that you
refer to was as follows:

"Resolved, by Washington State Grange,
that this body go on record as favoring
the adoption of a system of taxation
whereby personal property and all
improvements would be exempt from taxa­
tion and the burden of taxation be borne
by land values only."

"This, as you say, is the Single Tax, and
if, as you say, it would place the burden
of taxation on the farming class, then the
adoption of the resolution by the Wash­
ington State Grange was a bad thing, and
farmers should unite in opposition to every
move to take the burden of taxation off
property generally and place it on land
values only.

"But I take direct issue with your state­
ment. After ten years of close study of
the subject of taxation, as the respon­
sible head of the Washington State Grange,
I am positively convinced that this plan of
taxation is not only the best for the
farmers, but the only one that will take
the burden of taxation off the producers
and place it where it really belongs,
namely, on the beneficiaries of special
privilege.

"I am ready to defend this position in
the open, dear brother, and if you or any
farmer or representative of a farm organi­
zation will specify where the Single Tax
will injure the farmer, I will undertake to
answer and show you your mistake. This
is the way to make sure that the truth
shall win and that is what we all desire.

"C. B. REGLEY."

"Farming conditions in Washington and
Oregon are about the same. A method of
taxation that would help farmers in one
state would be equally valuable in another.
Farmers are heavily taxed on their
improvements, but if they will deduct from
their assessments the present value of
their clearing, draining, fencing, fruit
trees and buildings, it will be clear enough
that they will be much better off paying
the full land rent tax than they are under
the present tax burdens. Farmers espe­
cially will be handsomely repaid by a
considerable and unbiased study of this
proposed land and loan law.

"ARTHUR BROCK."

Because all the people are dependent on
the land, it is apparent that no tax is
intended for all the people. Any custom
that prevents unemployed people from
using otherwise idle land is wrong. Our
present custom sustains that condition.
This measure will abolish that custom.
Therefore it should be enacted.

"R. A. HARRIS, Salem, Oregon."
“The People's Land and Loan Measure should be adopted because it will destroy the crushing burden of speculative land value. Such value is an asset only to the mortgagee, the speculator and the bond-holder. To the actual producer and worker all this privately-owned land value is a debt on which they must pay rent or interest and taxes.

This State is now so inflated with artificial land values that farmers are being driven off the land and forced into the cities and the wage market because they cannot pay the interest and rent. The remedy is to take these unimproved land rental and interest values for improvements; thereby the speculators and franchise holders will be compelled to make restitution to the people of that which they never earned.

It is only just that the State should lend to the actual worker and improver some of that public fund until he can get his feet planted on the earth with a fair start for a home. "F. E. COULTER.”

“Solve the unemployed question, grant the poor man or woman the use of public vacant land by paying the taxes (land rent) on the same, so that he can be independent and self supporting, an independent producer instead of a job-hunting burden on the community.

“A. E. JOHNSON, "91 Park Street, Portland, Oregon.”

“Opportunity is knocking less and less at the door of the average citizen. The proposed Land and Loan Measure will broaden the field of opportunity for every industrious man to make a living for himself and family, even under our vicious competitive system. It will accomplish this by abolishing land monopoly and leaving the Earth in Oregon free to those who want to use it.

WILL H. DALY, "Commissioner of Public Utilities for Portland.”

“As free land is the basis of free man¬hood—of actual, tangible freedom; as the welfare of the people depends upon the accessibility of free land, and wages rise or fall as free land is near or far from the centers, this law which proposes to free the idle land of Oregon and open it to immediate settlement is the most vital issue ever submitted to an electorate.

LUKE NORTH, "Publisher of Everyman.”

“Every soul born into the World comes endowed with the inherent right to work on the land and create for himself sufficient for his needs.

From any eminence, as far as vision reaches, you behold vacant land and you know, of unemployed men. Here are the very wellsprings of wealth lying dormant and idle because the present laws make land speculation profitable. They are the very wellsprings of wealth lying dormant and idle because the present laws make land speculation profitable.

“This People's Land and Loan Law will give these idle men free access to Nature’s bounty and they will soon make Oregon's land indeed 'flowing with milk and honey.' Under this law free labor on free land will abolish the fear of want and with it will go all the anxious care and misery of involuntary poverty in Oregon.

EUGENE C. PROTZMAN, "Shoe Merchant.”

“Every one who studies this bill admits that it will abolish land speculation, reduce the price of land, (separate from improvements) and lower the rate of interest to farmers and home makers in town and country. No one says that any other measure before the people is intended to do these things, and very few people expect universal, employment and the return of good times of these things are done.

In taking all the land rent (separate from improvements) for public revenue the people will take only what they themselves produce. This is altogether just and right. The people bring the land rent with them when they come and take it away with them when they go. Most of the Portland landlords have had a chance to learn this from personal experience since 1914.

Four years ago the Anti-Singletaxers promised good times if the people would reject the graduated Singletax. It was rejected by a vote of more than two to one. Could times be much harder than they have been since 1912?

WM. S. UREN.”

“When this amendment is adopted in Oregon, the men who want homes, farms, factories and stores will settle on the best locations nearest to the markets and there work as freely as the pioneers who settled on the donation land claim and homesteads given to them by the government.

And employers will then bid up for laborers to an amount equal to the best wages men can make working for themselves on this free land, instead of laborers bidding down for jobs to the lowest wage on which they can half support their families.

Cheap land and low interest have always made high wages. This law will make both land and money cheap for the actual settlers and actual producers. It will abolish unemployment, poverty and the fear of want, because no man will see his wife and children suffer when he can get good free land for a home by paying the land rent tax.

G. M. ORTON.”

Respectfully submitted,

OREGON STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,

By O. R. Hartwig, President, 
By E. J. Stack, Secretary,
By Eugene E. Smith, President, 
By A. W. Jones, Vice-President, 
By E. J. Stack, Secretary.
ARGUMENT (Negative)

Submitted by Robt. E. Smith, Secretary, State Taxpayers' League opposing the Full Rental Value Land Tax and Homemakers' Loan Fund Amendment.

The "Full Rental Value Land Tax and Homemakers' Loan Fund Amendment" is a single tax measure. Because it is a single tax measure I am opposed to it.

By "full rental value land tax" it does not mean that only land which is owned by one party and rented to another is subject to a tax which is equal to the full rental value of the land exclusive of improvements made by the land of man. All land is subject to this full rent value land tax, even though it is used and occupied by the owner.

Single tax is based on the theory that all land belongs to the Government—that no one should own land outright, or, in other words, that there should be no private ownership in land. To put the "Full Rental Value Land Tax and Homemakers' Loan Fund Amendment" (single tax) into effect means the confiscation of private ownership to all land in Oregon. It means the destroying of private ownership to every home, farm and other class of land in Oregon.

To me, single tax has always seemed to be based solely on a socialistic theory. In fact, that it is socialistic. If socialism is right, then single tax is right, but if socialism is wrong in theory or impractical, then single tax should be rejected.

Single tax is not original with my friend U'Ren or even with Henry George. Ever since the time of the French Physiocrats, over a hundred years ago, there have been those who have advocated community ownership of land and the abolition of private ownership.

Since this idea (single tax) was rejected when land was owned largely by the government and not by individuals it seems to me that it would be extremely unwise to put this theory into practice now that land is owned so largely by individuals and so little of it by the government. In other words, a hundred years ago land throughout the United States was owned principally by the government. At that time the United States refused to adopt single tax (a policy whereby income from all land would belong to the government and land owners would only be tenants of the government). Time has gone on and the government has done everything it could to get land in private ownership. It would therefore seem an unwise public policy to declare by an act of the people that the income from all land, exclusive of improvements, belongs to the government and not to the individual who owns the land.

Because the "Full Rental Value Land Tax and Homemakers' Loan Fund" is a single tax measure, and because I believe single tax to be unsound and unworkable, I am opposed to it.

ROBT. E. SMITH,
Secretary, State Taxpayers' League.
(On Official Ballot, Nos. 306 and 307
ARGUMENT (Negative)

Submitted by Henry E. Reed, Assessor of Multnomah County, in opposition to the Full Rental Value Land Tax and Homemakers’ Loan Fund Amendment.

To the People of the State of Oregon:

This proposed amendment to the Constitution is based upon the doctrines asserted by Henry George, in “Progress and Poverty,” to the effect that private property in land is a social evil; that land must be made common property by substituting common ownership for individual ownership; and that the way to accomplish this end is to leave to the owners of land the shell, as represented by possession, and take the kernel by confiscation of rent. It is not a pure single tax measure as much as it permits other concurrent taxes. Since it follows the plan endorsed by Mr. George for establishing common ownership, it may be regarded, without misstatement of its purposes, as a measure to abolish private property in land. This view is supported by the wording of Subdivision “L,” which says one of the objects of the amendment is “to restore public ownership of land rent.” If the meaning of the passage just quoted is that the State of Oregon is entitled to resume something which it once owned, but sold or gave away, an error is apparent. The State of Oregon never has owned one foot of the soil of Oregon, except as the grantee of the United States, which relation it assumed fifty-seven years ago, when it entered into a compact with the United States, irrevocable without the consent of the Federal Government, never to interfere with the primary disposal of the soil of Oregon. Primary disposal of the soil of Oregon always has been vested in the United States, subject only to the Indian right of occupancy. If any sovereignty is entitled to resume that which it disposed of, the total value of the land, it is the United States, and not the State of Oregon.

The whole issue pertaining to this amendment was clearly stated by W. S. U’Ren in the Oregonian on July 19, 1916, as follows: “Is it morally right, and will its adoption be for the general welfare of the people?” To this question I answer, No.

If it is a question of morals, the State of Oregon has no right to “resume” ground rent which it never possessed, nor to “restore” community ownership which never existed in this State. Common or community ownership of land never was known to the races that settled America, except, possibly, in the distant times when they wandered over the face of the earth in tribes and tribes and otherwise by precarious methods. Individual ownership began when land had value, which was when settled conditions of agriculture appeared. It was known to the ancient peoples, and has been transmitted by them to us. For over one thousand years, land has been regarded in England as private property and has passed from person to person, sale, gift and bequest, under the most solemn sanctions of law. By the treaty which concluded our Revolutionary War, the powers of government of the United States, of Great Britain passed definitely to these States. From the beginning, the United States has exercised the granting power, with which it is vested, to the exclusion of all state governments, to the States of Oregon, and for a consideration set forth in an act of Congress. The first settlers—the men and women who saved Oregon to the United States—had only a possessory right to the land. The ownership of the soil on which they lived was in dispute between the United States and Great Britain until 1846. To acquire such rights as they secured, they crossed an unsettled country covering twenty-eight degrees of longitude, leaving behind them hundreds of people, and land that was as fair as any in the United States. Their journey, which has no parallel in history, was beset by hostile savages and other obstacles, which nature puts in the path of man. The land act of 1850 gave them the basis of their titles. The law was not a grant to settlers as such, but only to those settlers who lived upon and cultivated the land for four years and otherwise conformed to the conditions imposed by the United States. The pioneers earned their land by hard and incessant toil and privation.

Is it morally right to force common ownership upon these settlers and their descendants and grantees and compel them to become tenants of the State?

The value of land is only its net product—rent. The rate of rent at the time of purchase is the fair return on real estate investments. The Amendment proposes to take, through taxation, all of the rent and pay it into the State treasury. When such a tax as this is imposed, the present value of it falls for all time to come to the present owner. The capital value of the land is at once reduced to nil—confiscated by the taking of the whole ground rent. Mani-
It's not if there be no net rental, there can be no capital value remaining in the hands of the possessor of the title, be he the owner of a corporation or an individual, but the total value of the land will neither be increased nor decreased by the tax; it will remain the same whether the tax be high or low. What will occur is that the total value will be transferred to the State; the owner will retain the shell and the State will take the kernel. Rent, which Henry George denounces as a continuous robbery, will not cease, but will be paid to the State as universal landlord and tax collector.

If this Amendment should be adopted, mortgages secured by land will not be worth the paper on which they are written. One of the principal sufferers in this regard will be the Common School Fund of Oregon, which has $6,200,000, or more than 77 per cent of all the first mortgages on land. The Common School Fund has played a noble part in the upbuilding and support of Oregon's splendid public school system. In less than thirty years it has increased in value upwards of $6,750,000, which has been apportioned to the counties for the support of the schools. The impairment of this fund will seriously affect public education in Oregon to the extent of a revenue now approximating $400,000 a year. The mortgagors will not pay their debts. They will say to the State: "You now have the total value of the land. You keep the land and we will keep your money, pay you a ground rent tax, and borrow as much more as you will let us on our land improvements."

The Amendment makes no adequate provision for the taxation of railroads and public service corporations, which paid taxes in 1916 upon a valuation of $122,000,000 or 13 per cent of all the taxable property in the State. By the provisions of the Amendment, the personal property and land improvements, including stations, terminal buildings, rolling stock, tracks, wires and pipe lines, of these corporations would be exempt, and the right of way and other land would be taxed in the same manner as the land of an individual; that is, on the basis of the rent that a renter would pay for the land. Under the most favorable view that can be taken of this situation, there would be a heavy decrease in the amount of taxes now paid by this class of corporate property.

Henry George maintains that past generations cannot bind this generation to the principle of private ownership of land. If this generation accepts Mr. George's doctrine and establishes common ownership, what is to prevent the next generation, or even the next election, from repudiating leases made under this Amendment? If faith is not to be kept with present owners, why should it be kept with the State's tenants?

Local governments are authorized to hold annual elections to levy a special tax for local purposes on personal property and land improvements. These elections would greatly increase the cost of government. To levy such a tax in Portland for school, road, city and county purposes would require four separate elections—one each by the School District, the Road District, the City and the County.

No provision is made for the valuation of timber land, other than that standing timber of natural growth shall be assessed and taxed as part of the land on which it grows. That is to say, it is land, as is the case under existing law. But what is the ground rent of timber land, which constitutes some of the most valuable property in the State, and by what method is that ground rent to be ascertained?

One purpose of the Amendment is to help persons with no capital but their labor and character to make homes and farms, but no more than $1,500 may be loaned for the making of one home or farm. In this respect it is a rural credits measure. Rural credits are far better provided for by the Rural Credits Amendment, now before the people. All that the Land and Loan Amendment aims to do for farming development in Oregon, and more, too, can be accomplished by the Rural Credits Amendment, without transferring the total value of the land to the State and making land common property.

Oregon still owns 624,000 acres of school land, and the Federal Government has for sale between 15,000,000 and 16,000,000 acres in this State. Who will buy this land if the State is to take all the ground rent, and abolish private property in land?

This Amendment will not abolish involuntary unemployment and poverty. It will not make more work by stimulating building, unless we are to assume that there is a never-ending demand for building which no one will seriously assert. It will not of itself put more people on the land. It is absurd to say that men and women, without the rudiments of agricultural knowledge, can be turned out on the land in times of stress or intervals of unemployment, and be expected to make a living. Ground rent would not provide sufficient money for the expenses of government throughout Oregon. There is confession of this in Subdivision "R," which authorizes the levy of taxes on personal property and land improvements for local purposes, by local governments, which are the heaviest users of public funds. The principal effect of the Amendment would be to discourage forever any investment in real estate, create a State tenantry, turn Oregon topsy turvy, and retard its development.

HENRY E. REED,
Portland, Oregon.
Constitutional Amendments and Measures to be Submitted to

(On Official Ballot, Nos. 306 and 307)

ARGUMENT (Negative)

Submitted by A. H. Averill, Portland; T. M. Baldwin, Prineville; Wm. Brown, Salem; Leslie Butler, Hood River; Paul J. Brattain, Paisley; C. C. Colt, Portland, and others, in opposition to the Full Rental Value Land Tax and Homemakers' Loan Fund Amendment.

We oppose said Amendment for the following reasons:

Its purpose and effect are to confiscate all land titles, leaving to owners and mortgagees nothing but the improvements and the preferred right to become tenants of the State. It is therefore dishonest and probably unconstitutional.

It is founded on economic fallacies, and cannot accomplish any such beneficial results as it promises. It would create unequitable employment. It would have no favorable effect in that direction; and if it did, the unemployed would immediately flow in from elsewhere. It cannot stop speculation, except by saddling the owners with a tax burden. It would put an intolerable power in the hands of the taxing officers, and convert all who now own their homes and farms into mere tenants with an absentee landlord. It is in conflict with the existing Federal Farm Loan Act and pending State Rural Credits Amendment.

It would frighten away capital by the spectacle of confiscation; discourage home building by a system of tenures more expensive than ownership; take away the power of owners to borrow for improvements by destroying the security they have to offer; throw an added burden on the man who has not yet saved the money to improve his land and give the advantage to the one who has already improved; and lay a tax burden on the poor man equal to that of a rich man bears.

Its provisions conflict as to the respective rights of owners of improvements and purchases of land at tax sales; are impracticable of enforcement when applied to almost any class of lands; timber lands cannot be leased and may escape taxation; holders would not make substantial improvements on such leasing system; and it would tie up all State lands from sale. The proposed lending system is an absurdity. The loan feature of itself would add more than 50 per cent to present taxes. It would leave all capital untaxed except what is invested in unimproved lands; and thereby would cut off all present taxes on the railroads. It would create universal unequitable taxing acts. This would enormously increase the burden of land owners.

The requirement that the assessment roll shall be arranged alphabetically under owners' names would compel abandonment of the system of arrangement by descriptions now generally used, involving great expense and endless trouble in rewriting the rolls; and the requirement that a printed copy of the roll be furnished each taxpayer every five years would be very costly.

It does not recognize what owners have paid for road building, paving or other improvements as improvements; but lays an additional tax on the land because of the added value. All added values from public improvements made by taxation would be taken away from owners in additional taxes.

It would throw personal property and improvements open to confiscation at the will of any school district, town or county; and the confiscation and the confiscation proposals would be a great shock to confidence in any kind of property rights.

WOULD CONFLICT ALL LAND TITLES

Such is this law's intent and legal effect. Its sponsors believe that private ownership of land is wrong. Henry George has so taught them. Mr. O'Ren declares it is intended to put the Henry George theory into full practice in Oregon. Then it is well worth while to know what Henry George's theory is. At the head of his book, "Progress and Poverty," he declares:

"Private property in land is a bold, bare, enormous wrong, like that of chattel slavery."

In his book called "The Land Question," Chapter 8, p. 8, he says:

"In the very nature of things, land cannot be made individual property. This principle is absolute. The title of a peasant proprietor deserves no more respect than the title of a great territorial noble. No sovereign political power, no compact or agreement, even though consented to by the whole population of the globe, can give to an individual a valid title to the exclusive ownership of a square inch of soil."

In "Progress and Poverty," at p. 8, Chapter 2, Mr. George says:

"We should satisfy the law of justice and meet all economic requirements, by abolishing at one stroke all private titles, declaring all land public property, and letting it out to the highest bidders in lots to suit, under such conditions as would secretly guard the private right to improvements. This would sacrifice the security they have to offer; throw an added burden on the man who has not yet saved the money to improve his land and give the advantage to the one who has already improved; and lay a tax burden on the poor man equal to that of a rich man bears."

Its provisions conflict as to the respective rights of owners of improvements and purchases of land at tax sales; are impracticable of enforcement when applied to almost any class of lands; timber lands cannot be leased and may escape taxation; holders would not make substantial improvements on such leasing system; and it would tie up all State lands from sale. The proposed lending system is an absurdity. The loan feature of itself would add more than 50 per cent to present taxes. It would leave all capital untaxed except what is invested in unimproved lands; and thereby would cut off all present taxes on the railroads. It would create universal unequitable taxing acts. This would enormously increase the burden of land owners.

The requirement that the assessment roll shall be arranged alphabetically under owners' names would compel abandonment of the system of arrangement by descriptions now generally used, involving great expense and endless trouble in rewriting the rolls; and the requirement that a printed copy of the roll be furnished each taxpayer every five years would be very costly.

It does not recognize what owners have paid for road building, paving or other improvements as improvements; but lays an additional tax on the land because of the added value. All added values from public improvements made by taxation would be taken away from owners in additional taxes.

It would throw personal property and improvements open to confiscation at the will of any school district, town or county; and the confiscation proposals would be a great shock to confidence in any kind of property rights.

WOULD CONFLICT ALL LAND TITLES

Such is this law's intent and legal effect. Its sponsors believe that private ownership of land is wrong. Henry George has so taught them. Mr. O'Ren declares it is intended to put the Henry George theory into full practice in Oregon. Then it is well worth while to know what Henry George's theory is. At the head of his book, "Progress and Poverty," he declares:

"Private property in land is a bold, bare, enormous wrong, like that of chattel slavery."

In his book called "The Land Question," Chapter 8, p. 8, he says:

"In the very nature of things, land cannot be made individual property. This principle is absolute. The title of a peasant proprietor deserves no more respect than the title of a great territorial noble. No sovereign political power, no compact or agreement, even though consented to by the whole population of the globe, can give to an individual a valid title to the exclusive ownership of a square inch of soil."

In "Progress and Poverty," at p. 8, Chapter 2, Mr. George says:

"We should satisfy the law of justice and meet all economic requirements, by abolishing at one stroke all private titles, declaring all land public property, and letting it out to the highest bidders in lots to suit, under such conditions as would secretly guard the private right to improvements. This would sacrifice the security they have to offer; throw an added burden on the man who has not yet saved the money to improve his land and give the advantage to the one who has already improved; and lay a tax burden on the poor man equal to that of a rich man bears."

Its provisions conflict as to the respective rights of owners of improvements and purchases of land at tax sales; are impracticable of enforcement when applied to almost any class of lands; timber lands cannot be leased and may escape taxation; holders would not make substantial improvements on such leasing system; and it would tie up all State lands from sale. The proposed lending system is an absurdity. The loan feature of itself would add more than 50 per cent to present taxes. It would leave all capital untaxed except what is invested in unimproved lands; and thereby would cut off all present taxes on the railroads. It would create universal unequitable taxing acts. This would enormously increase the burden of land owners.

The requirement that the assessment roll shall be arranged alphabetically under owners' names would compel abandonment of the system of arrangement by descriptions now generally used, involving great expense and endless trouble in rewriting the rolls; and the requirement that a printed copy of the roll be furnished each taxpayer every five years would be very costly.

It does not recognize what owners have paid for road building, paving or other improvements as improvements; but lays an additional tax on the land because of the added value. All added values from public improvements made by taxation would be taken away from owners in additional taxes.

It would throw personal property and improvements open to confiscation at the will of any school district, town or county; and the confiscation proposals would be a great shock to confidence in any kind of property rights.

WOULD CONFLICT ALL LAND TITLES

Such is this law's intent and legal effect. Its sponsors believe that private ownership of land is wrong. Henry George has so taught them. Mr. O'Ren declares it is intended to put the Henry George theory into full practice in Oregon. Then it is well worth while to know what Henry George's theory is. At the head of his book, "Progress and Poverty," he declares:

"Private property in land is a bold, bare, enormous wrong, like that of chattel slavery."

In his book called "The Land Question," Chapter 8, p. 8, he says:

"In the very nature of things, land cannot be made individual property. This principle is absolute. The title of a peasant proprietor deserves no more respect than the title of a great territorial noble. No sovereign political power, no compact or agreement, even though consented to by the whole population of the globe, can give to an individual a valid title to the exclusive ownership of a square inch of soil."

In "Progress and Poverty," at p. 8, Chapter 2, Mr. George says:

"We should satisfy the law of justice and meet all economic requirements, by abolishing at one stroke all private titles, declaring all land public property, and letting it out to the highest bidders in lots to suit, under such conditions as would secretly guard the private right to improvements. This would not only be unjust; the second needless. Let the individuals who now hold it retain, if they want to, the possession of what they are pleased to call their land, let them buy
and sell, and bequeath and devise it. We may safely leave them the shell if we take the land (for you may rely in some cases) land: it is only necessary to confiscate rent. We already take some rent in taxation. We have only to make some changes in our present taxation, and take it all. What I therefore propose is to appropriate rent by taxation. In this way the State may become the universal landlord without calling herself so."

Again in "The Land Question", at page 54, Mr. George says:

"Anyone can see, that to tax land up to its full value, would amount to precisely the same thing as formally to take possession of it, and then let it out to the highest bidders."

Now you know that, when the followers of Henry George propose to take the rent in taxes, they mean thereby to make the land common property, leaving to the former owners a mere paper title. George was right on his law. Any court will hold, that to give one a perpetuity the full rent of property, confers the absolute title. If you vote for this law, you vote to yield up to the State the very substance of your title, leaving for yourself the "shell without the kernel." The mere right to own improvements on another's land.

**BASED ON FALLACY**

The whole philosophy of Henry George is based on the fallacy that poverty is due to private ownership of land. Therefore, he published in 1881 the statement that all the desirable lands of Oregon and Washington were gone; that immigrants who had come here with capital and industry to begin farming, were retreading the long journey to their old homes, sorely wasted in fortune by their fruitless quest. The exhaustion of the available lands was a theory and an assumption, made to fill the fallacies of a dreamer. If poverty were, as he had convinced himself, due to the lack of land in private ownership, it would not do to have available lands and poverty coexistent. Yet, there then lay out in God's sunlight, untouched by man, millions of acres of the finest wheat lands and future orchards on the continent of America. That single fact demonstrates that George's theory is false.

**WILL THROW ALL THE BURDEN ON THE OCCUPIERS**

If this law works as the single-taxers expect it will, all the burden of taxation will be thrown on the occupied and used lands. Their theory is, that one who can afford to hold land, he does not use. Very well, then,—owners will cease to pay taxes on the lands they do not occupy; and all the taxes must come from the occupied lands. The theory is: thereby greatly increasing the burden on the ones this law pretends to help.

**MAY NOT BE ENFORCEABLE AGAINST LANDS WITH IMPROVEMENTS**

Lands are to be sold if the annual rent is not paid; and its policy is "to protect all persons in the absolute ownership of all of their land improvements and income therefrom." Subsection "D" it says: "The title and ownership of improvements on, in or under any land sold for taxes, shall not be acquired by the State or any other purchaser on such sale, unless the improvements are necessary for the improvements on the improvements." No tax can be levied on the improvements except a special one. Now, under the general tax land can be sold. How is the purchaser of ground on which a dwelling stands, or a farm has been cleared, to get the benefit of his purchase? He is absolutely forbidden to take away the owner's improvements. The provision for a sale of the land, and the provision that the owner shall retain, absolute title to his improvements, are irreconcilable. One or the other must yield.

**WILL VASTLY INCREASE TAXES**

This law will add 50 per cent and more to the present taxes at one stroke. One-third of the proceeds goes to the loan fund, so only two-thirds will be available for other purposes. In addition, it devotes the inheritance taxes to the loan fund. They amount to $75,000 annually. When all the rental value of ground is taken away from owners by taxation, they cannot be expected to bear longer the street improvements and other municipal assessments; and these will have to be added in some way to the general taxes, which will mean an enormous screw-up the general taxes (land rents) for this purpose, we shall get only two-thirds of the added proceeds of our squeezing, as one-third of all the increase must go into the loan fund. The basis on which assessments may be bonded will be gone: that being the assessed value, which will no longer exist. Altogether, it is a most miserable hodgepodge.

It will strike from the rolls everything on which railroads and other public service corporations are paying taxes, except the bare unimproved right of way. The total on which such companies now pay taxes is $123,000,000, yielding about one-eighth of all our taxes. The unimproved land right of way and station grounds, which is all that will be left to tax, are valued by the Public Service Commission at only about 15 per cent of the amount on which the railroads now pay. Thus 85 per cent would be lost from the tax roll, and the loss of this item alone will greatly increase the taxes.

**OWNERS CANNOT BORROW**

Owners now borrow on the safe security of the land and improvements, in order to build. The most substantial element is the land value. That is all to be taken away by this proposed amendment. Will lenders advance money, on the shadowy security of a five-year lease? This amendment, pretending to be drawn to help the man who has not got his land improved, takes away the only resource he has to raise the money with which to improve. It exempts the improvements of the man...
who has already built and has income-bearing property, and shifts the extra burden to the shoulders of him who is trying to save the money with which to build.

WILL CONFLICT WITH RURAL CREDITS LAWS

These laws, the Federal one just enacted and the State one pending, assume that the farmer will have his land on which to borrow; which he will not if this amendment passes.

MIGHT CUT OREGON OFF FROM NEW FEDERAL LOAN BENEFITS

Congress has just enacted a law intended to afford great relief to farmers, by providing them cheap loans with easy terms. Sec. 12 thereof says: "No such loan shall exceed 50 per cent. of the value of the land mortgaged and 20 per cent. of the value of the permanent, insured improvements thereon, said value to be ascertained by an appraiser," etc. Sec. 30 provides that the Commissioner shall examine the laws of every State respecting land titles and assure himself (with the advice of the Attorney General) as to whether or not they assure the holders of first mortgages adequate safeguards; and if not, such State may be declared ineligible to participate in the benefits of the Farm Loan Law. What would happen to Oregon, if this amendment to our Constitution should carry?

TIMBER LANDS MAY NOT BE TAXABLE UNDER THIS LAW

It permits no tax except the "land rent," which is defined as the "fair and just rental, and shall be no tax or other charge to be paid by the renter for the use of the land except the appraised land rent, and there shall be no tax on the market value [except for 1919]." Why doesn't that exempt timber land, except possibly from payment of the annual grazing value? The State's lessee will be a mere tenant for years, with no right to cut the timber, but liable in damages if he does. What price per year would the public officers fix as the rent? It cannot be a stumpage charge based on what is cut, for the tenant may not choose to cut. To prophesy that the owners must all begin cutting their timber and paying a stumpage charge annually, is too absurd for any of the proponents of this law, except one.

WILL STOP THE TAKING OF GOVERNMENT LANDS AND RUB PRESENT OWNERS

Who will pay the Government price in money and toll, to acquire a desert claim or homestead, when, on the very instant the United States patents it to the donee, "his heirs and assigns forever," the State of Oregon is by this law to take away absolutely all the land the State has granted? There is much good Government land still open in Oregon, with the prospect of immediate large additions out of the O. & C. R. R. grant. Shall we vote a law which takes out of the hands of the Government the 66 2/3 per cent. of the lands sold by it to the settler or purchaser, the full value is transferred automatically to the State in its taxing capacity? It is the most dishonest legislative proposal, the rankest appeal to selfish supposed interest, ever brought forward. If the State wants to rent these lands to occupiers at their full value, then let the State devise some means to get them from the Government honestly, so that it will have a moral right to rent them.

IDLE LANDS

The single-taxers' pet argument is that this law will force the idle land into use—that nobody can afford to hold land out of use if it passes, and that this will mean enormous development at once. It is self-evident that nobody in the world will hold land out of use which, in his judgment, could be made to pay by using it. But the single-taxer says he is holding it for a rise. Nonsense. He could use it now, if it would pay, and get the rise just the same, couldn't he? His using it meantime isn't going to keep it from rising. It is not a commodity which perishes in the use.

Now, how about taxation forcing idle lands into use? If there is to be any sense to the discussion, we will have to consider kinds separately. Grazing lands are substantially all used by somebody now; and no paying mines are being held idle for a rise—not if the owner knows they would pay.

Water powers are a prime subject for single-taxers to declaim about. Under this law, only the water privilege and the sites and ground used can be taxed. These are in large part tied up in Government withdrawals. The Federal law does not permit their development on any basis acceptable to capital. A proposed new development of vast size is said now to be going over to Canada because, under the Federal law, all it can get here is a thirty year lease, on substantially the same terms as the single-taxers now propose to offer five-year leases. If water power capital will not make developments on thirty year renewable leases, what will it say to five-year ones? The purchase price of the site is a minor item; from $2.80 to $6.00 per horse power; while development has cost, in the case of the powers now in use, over $200 per horse power. Power sites therefore represent from 1 to 3 per cent. of the investment.

Timber does not need any forcing into market. Plenty is coming all the 'time to meet requirements, and more is eager.
This law is meaningless as to timber anyway. Will some single-taxer please explain what beneficial interest in the timber land the owner will still have for his money after this proposed amendment becomes a law?

Idle agricultural lands are mostly in Government ownership, open to any taker. While this nest of single-tax dreamers have been hatching their plots for twenty years to take the lands away from the owners, thousands and thousands of men and women who really wanted to get at the land have taken their homesteads and built their homes. Now these single-taxers would take these homes away, calling the owners monopolists, and would make the owners mere tenants of the State from year to year, paying full rent to an absent landlord.

The logged-off land problem has been labored with to the point where it is demonstrated that the cost of clearing, in most instances, is twice what the land is worth when cleared. If these lands were being given away, it would make no practical difference in the situation. What agricultural lands is it these men are so anxious to get at, and which they say are being held out of use?

CITY BUILDING REGULATED BY DEMAND

One would suppose from single tax literature that there are vast numbers of city lots, ripe and ready for immediate improvement, which the monopolist owners are selfishly holding out of possible present profitable use, in order to make lands "scarce" and force up the price; and that if the selling value were all taken out of them, by levying a tax of the full rent, these deplorable conditions would immediately cease,—owners would be eager to sell, would put up the anything by selling, and no land would be held "idle," but it would all be promptly built on and used. According to that theory, there never can legitimately be any "idle" land which is "scarce," for the city must be like a blowfly—as big when born as it is ever to be. Otherwise, the land within or surrounding it not yet occupied is "idle" land, and the people who own it and pay taxes and assessments for years, while waiting until it can be used, are "holding it out of use." A man may own any other kind of property in the world and keep it idle when there is not any profitable use for it, except a piece of land; but if he owns a piece of land, he must be kept dancing all the time, like a turkey on a hot stove. When Portland was laid out in 1852, it contained 2.10 square miles, mostly "idle" land. Now it contains 66.31 square miles, or exclusive of the river 63.61 miles, of which 21.10 square miles are platted, still largely idle land. But it has houses enough for all the people, and then a few, and buildings enough for all the business too. When more are needed, they will build it. Will some "idle" land ready for future needs.

WILL NOT MAKE LAND CHEAPER

The basic assumption on which this amendment rests is, that by taking the whole rental value for taxation, the land will be made cheaper. The man who wants a good city lot for a home or a nice little farm can just go out and take one. Our contention is, that NO TAX, NOT EVEN ONE UP TO THE FULL RENTAL VALUE LIKE THAT PROPOSED, CAN MAKE THE LAND ONE BIT CHEAPER IN THE LONG RUN TO THE NEW PURCHASER; BUT THAT IF SUCH A LAW WERE ENACTED AND REALLY ENFORCED, THE LAND WOULD COST THE NEW PURCHASER MORE THAN UNDER THE PRESENT LAW. If the full rental value were actually taken for taxes, this law proposes, of course, the selling price or capital value of the land would disappear entirely, and the present owners would be robbed of all they invested in it. But the land would not be made any cheaper in the long run to the man who wanted to occupy it; but dearer rather. He would buy on the perpetual installment plan, the payments always increasing but never through, like a usurer's loan. The old speculative element would be there still, divided into five-year installments, and charged to him in advance, each time he came to take a five-year lease from the taxing officers. When a man buys under the existing system, he pays a price fixed as the present value. If the land goes up, he gets the benefit from the rise. Whereas, under the proposed amendment, as the land goes up, the annual installments of perpetual purchase price he must pay rise accordingly; and he gets no benefit of the rise. The single-taxer's talk about encouraging peo­ple to get homes for themselves, is sham. They mean merely to take the benefit of the increase of the instalment price for taxation, to those who do not work or own it, which will discourage home owning. Instead of encouraging it. One of the main inducements to buy a home now, is to get the benefit of the increase of value that is anticipated. That inducement will be totally gone under the proposed law. Instead of this prospective gain, the home builder will have to face a prospective fine each five years in the increase of the installment price for the right to occupy his home, which he is never to get through paying for nor to own. The prime object of single-taxers, in any law they propose, is to make those who hold land as occupants or otherwise pay more for it, and not less, on the theory that in the past owners have been getting what the public was entitled to.

STATE LANDS WOULD BE TIED UP UNDER A DETESTABLE SYSTEM OF LANDLORDISM

Oregon has 625,000 acres of school lands and some 300,000 acres in Carey Act projects which cannot be sold if this amendment carries. It is not intended
that any lands the State owns shall ever hereafter pass into private ownership. The policy of absentee landlordism is to prevent, by sale of unimproved lands—
the absentee landlord, acting through its agents, unable to show mercy, but bound to collect the last penny of rent, whether the crops fall or what not.

MORTGAGORS WILL LOSE THEIR LANDS

This amendment would sweep away all the margin many owners have above present mortgages. It would take the site value of the land and bestow it on the State. The mortgagees would then have to realize their loans out of the improvements alone. An avalanche of foreclosure suits would sweep into the courts. The picture of what this means in most instances is too terrible to dwell on. The lands will belong to the State, and the improvements will belong to the former mortgagees, who are in many instances absentee.

WILL HIT THE POOR MAN HARDEST

Shifting all the taxes to the bare, unimproved land value means that the present owner of uncleared, unimproved lands—the struggling newcomer who undertakes by years of labor to convert land covered with brush and stumps into an orchard or farm—must pay as much taxes per acre while he is doing it, as his rich neighbor, owning a fine, developed farm or orchard, with the best improvements. Yet it is called a measure in the interest of the poor man.

WILL FRIGHTEN CAPITAL

If we confiscate the investments of those who have been induced to buy our lands, what confidence will other sorts of investors have? The leading men who advocate this measure are socialists as well as single-taxers. They would like to confiscate capital as well as land, the factories as well as the ground. This law will give them the power to do that in any county, town, or school district, by a majority vote, with no constitutional protection. If we show the world a spectacle of land confiscation, capitalists will not be likely to invest, in the face of the possibility that they will likewise be robbed.

WOULD WRECK CONFIDENCE

The passage of this law would destroy all confidence of investors with capital. The Government has granted the titles in fee simple absolute, "to the donee and his heirs and assigns forever." The State has sold hundreds of thousands of acres with like assurance of perpetual title. What would one who had bought thought of our honesty, if we said, "We bought this land, and paid the people of Oregon its price. We think we made a mistake when we sold it. We have taken it away from you, by vote. We are not going to give you its value, nor your money back, either. That is lumped out at interest for the school fund. But we are honest people, and will give you the first chance to lease it, for the full rental value, on our own terms, for five years. What will all men and women think of us? The single-taxers say this is a moral question. It is. The State now has $6,500,000 in the school fund from the sale of these lands. Our children will be going to school on the interest from stolen money, if this amendment carries.

POSSIBLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL

We challenge the constitutionality of this law, as attempting to take property without due process, contrary to the United States Constitution, in that, first, it levies a tax of the full rental value, without regard to taxing needs, and is, therefore, as said in Henderson Bridge Co. vs. Henderson, 173 U. S. 615, "Spoliation under the guise of exerting the power to tax." And, second, it provides no opportunity for a hearing of the aggrieved taxpayer concerning the proper amount of rent to be charged, to correct errors, or for an appeal. The existing law respecting hearings before the Equalization Board cannot apply; for that Board can equalize only on the basis of "full cash value," which is no longer to be taxable.

Oregon has been pestered with this agitation to destroy land titles for eight years. It is the propaganda of a Fels commission, the work of a multimillionaire across the continent, who set his heart to try out here the economic heresies of Henry George. Its proposers offer, not solid arguments for this law, but "before-taking" testimonials as to the great results we may expect. When even a box of salve tells us on its word of honor that it will painlessly remove warts, corns and bald heads, we are not minded to try the remedy if we have one of the diseases. Spoliation was not be won over by any of these recommendations. None of these people ever lived under single tax. Rather let us do as the people of Missouri did: settle the question by a vote of five to one against it.

A. H. AVERILL, Portland
T. M. BALDWIN, Prineville
WM. BROWN, Salem
LESLIE BUTLER, Hood River
PAUL J. BRATTAIIN, Paisley
C. C. COTL, Portland
GRANT B. DILMICK, Oregon City
CHAS. W. DUNN, Portland
JOHN GILL, Portland
GEO. II. MERRYMAN, Klamath Falls
GEO. W. MILLER, Baker
A. W. NOLBLAD, Astoria
WILLIAM POLLMAN, Baker
ALFRE'l' D. SCHMITT, Albany
BEN SELLING, Portland
H. J. TAYLOR, Pendleton
W. LAIR THOMPSON, Lakeview
A. L. VIGAZIE, Portland
IRA WADE, Toledo
JOHN B. YEON, Portland
AN AMENDMENT

To the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, to amend Article XIV by adding a section thereto to be designated as Section 4 thereof, proposed by initiative petition filed in the office of the Secretary of State, July 6, 1916.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed amendment will be printed on the official ballot:

Constitutional Amendment—Proposed by Initiative Petition

initiated by the Commercial Association of the City of Pendleton, W. E. Brock, President; C. K. Cranston, Secretary.—FOR PENDLETON NORMAL SCHOOL AND RATIFYING LOCATION CERTAIN STATE INSTITUTIONS Purpose—To provide for locating a State Normal School at Pendleton, Oregon, upon a site to be donated therefor, appropriating $125,000 for buildings and equipment and levying an annual tax of one twenty-fifth of a mill on all property in the state for its maintenance, and ratifying the location of certain state institutions heretofore located away from the State Capital.

Vote YES or NO.

308 Yes.

309 No.

A BILL

For an Initiative law to amend Article XIV of the Constitution of the State of Oregon by adding a section thereto to be designated as Section 4 thereof, providing for the validation of the location of the University of Oregon, the Oregon State Agricultural College, and the respective branches thereof; the Oregon Normal School at Monmouth, Polk county, Oregon; the Southern Oregon State Normal School at Ashland, Jackson county, Oregon; and providing also for locating a standard state normal school at Pendleton, in Umatilla county, Oregon, and for the construction, equipment and maintenance thereof.

Be it Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon,

That:

Article XIV of the Constitution of the State of Oregon shall be and hereby is amended by adding thereto the following section, which shall be designated as Section 4, of Article XIV.

Section 4. The location of the following public institutions of the State of Oregon, to-wit: The University of Oregon, at Eugene, Lane county, Oregon, and the branches thereof, including the Medical Department thereof at Portland, Multnomah county, Oregon; the State Agricultural College at Corvallis, Benton county, Oregon, and all branches thereof; the Oregon Normal School at Monmouth, Polk county, Oregon, and the Southern Oregon State Normal School at Ashland, Jackson county, Oregon, are hereby expressly validated; and in order to provide adequate normal school instruction for the teachers of the grade schools in Oregon, there is hereby located in Pendleton, Umatilla county, Oregon, or within two miles thereof, a normal school known as the State Normal School at Pendleton, which shall be conducted as a standard normal school as defined by law; provided, that before the expiration of sixty days after this amendment has been adopted there shall be donated to the State of Oregon for the purpose of said normal school suitable grounds for the erection of necessary buildings, and the Board of Control of the State of Oregon, consisting of the Governor, Secretary of State, and State Treasurer, are hereby directed to proceed within said time to determine whether any grounds offered or donated are suitable for the purpose, and said officers are hereby authorized to accept any site which they may deem suitable.

Promptly thereafter the Board of Regents of the Oregon State Normal School, with the authority conferred pursuant to Chapter 22, of Title 32, of Lord's Oregon Laws, are hereby directed to grade
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and lay out said site and cause to be erected thereon such buildings and other structures as they may deem necessary, and to do all things necessary and advisable in connection therewith in order to build and organize said institution with all reasonable dispatch consistent with the State's best interest. If same reasonably can be done, said Board is hereby directed to cause said school to be opened at a convenient time during the fall of the year 1917. They are hereby authorized, whenever deemed advisable, to appoint a President and such assistants as may be necessary to carry on the work of said school, all in accordance with Chapter 22, of Title 32, referred to above. This amendment is self-executing and all constitutional provisions in conflict herewith are hereby repealed. To carry out the provisions of this amendment, and for the location, construction and equipment of said normal school there is hereby appropriated out of any money in the General Fund not otherwise appropriated, the sum of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be necessary to be expended under the direction of said Board in the manner provided by law. Provided, that said Board shall build out of said appropriation a suitable administration building and a dormitory for girls. For the support and maintenance of said normal school, including the payment of salaries of teachers and employees; to keep buildings, grounds and other property thereof in repair; and for the construction of buildings and additions to same if necessary; for the purchase of library books, laboratory supplies and apparatus, and for the payment of necessary incidental expenses, there is hereby levied an annual tax of one-twenty-fifth (1-25) of a mill upon each dollar of all the taxable property within the State of Oregon. Such tax shall be collected, and the fund arising therefrom shall be paid into the State Treasury and shall be known as the "Pendleton Normal School Fund," and shall be paid out only on warrants drawn by the Secretary of State on the State Treasurer against said fund, under the supervision and direction of the Board of Regents of said Normal School. If any portion of said fund shall not be used during the fiscal year, the balance remaining shall be carried over until the next year, and added to the fund for that year, and the State officers are hereby authorized and directed to allow all claims payable out of such fund regardless of the date when contracted.

For affirmative argument see pages 25-27.

For negative argument see page 28.
the Voters of Oregon, General Election, November 7, 1916

(On Official Ballot, Nos. 308 and 309)

ARGUMENT (Affirmative)

Submitted by the Commercial Association of the City of Pendleton, and others, in behalf of the proposed Constitutional Amendment For Pendleton Normal School and Ratifying Location Certain State Institutions.

The constitutional amendment validating the location of Oregon's educational institutions and providing for a State normal school at Pendleton is a corrective, constructive measure required by the urgent needs of the State.

The value of the validation clause rests upon the fact the original constitution of Oregon specifically provided that all State institutions should be located at the State capital. The State University, Oregon Agricultural College, Oregon's greatest and the Ashland Normal were located in apparent violation of the constitution. An amendment passed by the people in 1908, corrects the matter by inference; but does not do so in specific terms. That amendment was not proposed for any such purpose. The amendment now proposed will set at rest all question as to the constitutionality of the present locations of the institutions referred to. The step should be taken to save the schools from possible litigation over this point.

STRONG ENDORSEMENTS

The measure proposed by the Pendleton Commercial Association and others, has the approval and support of the State's leading educators and representative men and women.

The following endorsements of the measure have been given and are published by permission:

By James Withycombe, Governor of Oregon: "The public school is the bulwark of our civilization. School efficiency depends upon the teacher and the Normal School is the potential factor in the preparation of the teacher for successful work. Oregon is unquestionably in need of more normal school work and Pendleton is the logical place for a school of this class in Eastern Oregon. The local schools of Pendleton offer excellent facilities for practice teaching, and the general environment is good.

"The movement is worthy of the support of every citizen of the State,"

By J. A. Churchill, State Superintendent of Public Instruction: "Oregon's greatest need for its rural schools, is the teacher who has had full preparation to do her work. Such a preparation can best come through normal school training. I trust that the voters of the State will assist in raising the standard of our schools by establishing a State normal school at Pendleton. The location is central, the interest of the people of Pendleton in education most excellent, and the large number of pupils in the public schools will give ample opportunity to all students to get the amount of teaching practice required in a standard normal school."

By W. J. Kerr, President of the Oregon Agricultural College: "It is my judgment that as soon as practicable, when adequate funds are available, three good normal schools should be maintained in Oregon, one in the southern part of the State, one in the eastern part of State, and the one at Monmouth. Since the people of Pendleton are initiating a measure for the establishment of a normal school at that place, it will give me pleasure to support this measure."

MONMOUTH PRESIDENT APPROVES

By J. H. Ackerman, President Oregon Normal School, at Monmouth: "I have fully made up my mind to support the measure. I will say, however, that this does not carry with it the support of the Board of Regents, but only my individual support, and the influence that I may exert as an individual in favor of it."

BY THE COUNTY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS OF OREGON

"Resolved, that it is the sense of the County School Superintendents of the State of Oregon, in convention assembled, that the best interests of the schools of the State demand increased facilities for the training of teachers, and that we, therefore, endorse the initiative measure to establish a normal school at Pendleton."

"J. C. Sturgill, President County Superintendents Association; Lincoln Savage, Secretary. Committee—S. E. Notson, Morrow County; O. C. Brown, Douglas County; H. J. Simpson, Wheeler County; B. W. Barnes, Washtington County; J. Percy Wells, Jackson County."

Mrs. Charles H. Castner, President of the Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs: "Believing that the time has arrived when it is necessary to make additional provision for the normal training of our public school teachers, and that the great distances of our State make it advisable that a school be located in the eastern section, I therefore most heartily endorse the location of said normal school at Pendleton."
By Mrs. George W. McMath, Portland, Oregon: "Recognizing the need for additional normal schools in Oregon for the training of teachers, I take pleasure in endorsing the constitutional amendment providing for a State normal school at Pendleton." By A. L. Mills, President of the First National Bank of Portland: "I have always believed that there should be two normal schools in the State of Oregon, one on each side of the mountains. When the distance to travel and the expense make it impossible for one normal school to adequately serve the whole State, I shall be pleased to do what I can to aid in the establishment of a school at Pendleton to serve the people of Eastern Oregon." By Dr. Charles J. Smith, Portland, Oregon: "The schools intended for the instruction of our teachers should not be confined to one community or one geographical division in the State of Oregon, largely owing to its size and the expense of transportation from the remote parts of the State to the one normal school at Monmouth, in the western part of the State, consequently it becomes the duty of the State to establish schools in other geographical locations and eventually in all geographical locations in order to accommodate the largest number of citizens who desire education of this kind and who in turn teach our children."

ELIMINATES "LOGROLLING"

Eastern Oregon pays her just share of taxation and is entitled to the accommodation so necessary along educational lines. Insomuch as this is on a mileage basis it will eliminate this school from legislative "logrolling" and thereby not interfere in any way with other proposed legislative work in this State.

OREGON'S GREATEST "PREPAREDNESS" NEED

When the President called out the National Guard for service on the Mexican border, Oregon was proud of the regiment it had in readiness for immediate duty. If there should be a call to mobilize the properly trained teachers of this State (for educational service) Oregon could not make such a favorable showing.

Statistics furnished by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and compiled from official records show that during the year 1915 a total of 6065 public school teachers were employed in Oregon. Of that number only 791 were normal school graduates. In other words, but thirteen percent of our teachers are properly trained, and eighty-seven percent are imperfectly educated for the important work they have to perform. In 1913, eighty percent of the applicants for certificates in Oregon had received no training above the eighth grade.

ONE THOUSAND TEACHERS NEEDED

Vacancies in the Oregon schools each year call for the teachers of forty. One normal school is turning out approximately one-tenth that number, leaving school authorities to select the remainder of the teachers as best they may. The rural schools are the chief sufferers because in such schools, the percentage of normal trained teachers is the lowest. At the same time, the need of highly-trained teachers is the greatest in rural schools because of the absence of supervision.

Plainly, the situation is such that the 137,640 pupils in the public schools of Oregon cannot receive the grade of instruction called for by present conditions of life, and the taxpayers of Oregon are not obtaining the results they should get from the large sums spent annually for public school purposes (in 1914, $7,199,471.78). Efficiency cannot be expected under the conditions that now obtain.

WHERE THE BLAME RESTS

The blame rests squarely upon the State for not providing more adequate normal instruction. The last reports of the United States Commission of Education shows that only five states in the Union have less normal school equipment than has Oregon. Oregon has less normal school equipment than forty states of the Union. Forty states of the Union have more than one normal; New York having eighteen, Pennsylvania eighteen, Massachusetts twelve, California eight, Washington three, and Idaho two.

COMPARATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

The United States Bureau of Education report for 1914 (page 357) gives the following data as to appropriations for Northwest and Pacific Coast normal schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1908-9</th>
<th>1909-10</th>
<th>1910-11</th>
<th>1913-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$44,030</td>
<td>$61,750</td>
<td>$65,882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>222,852</td>
<td>276,379</td>
<td>324,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>172,500</td>
<td>204,041</td>
<td>265,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>299,350</td>
<td>330,926</td>
<td>366,490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUILDING APPROPRIATIONS

Data as to appropriations for school buildings and improvements during the past six years is to be found on page 358, Bureau of Education report for 1914. The figures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$114,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>175,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>222,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>299,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>324,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>330,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>366,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,554,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the foregoing it will be seen that compared with neighboring states, Oregon's expenditures for normal school purposes have been ridiculously small. Idaho with a population of 395,407 compared with 783,249, population in Oregon has regularly been spending over twice the sum this State has devoted to normal instruction.

UNIVERSAL CRITICISM

The situation in Oregon is such as to cause universal criticism from the teach-
Eastern Oregon now imports most of its teachers and salary inducements must be made to secure such teachers. The report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction shows that the average salary paid female teachers in Eastern Oregon is $10.41 per month greater than the average salary paid similar teachers in the Willamette Valley counties, including Multnomah. There are 1,492 teachers employed in the Eastern Oregon counties and this salary situation means a burden of $174,040.00 per annum more than the Willamette Valley counties have to pay for similar teaching service. The sum is four times greater than the annual maintenance desired for the proposed State normal school at Pendleton. The failure of the State to provide proper normal instruction for Eastern Oregon works for added expense, not for economy to the taxpayers.

Vote "Yes" on this measure and give the school children of Oregon some advantages that are enjoyed by school children of our neighboring states.

COMMERCIAL ASSOCIATION OF THE CITY OF PENDLETON,
By W. E. Brock, President.
J. N. Burgess, W. L. Thompson, W. J. Furnish, C. M. Rice,
Chas. J. Smith.

The Eastern Oregon State Normal School was established at Weston in 1886 by legislative enactment. This school is still in existence. Its plant consists of four buildings occupying ten acres of ground donated by the City. It has a commodious school building with three stories and a basement, erected in 1901; a young women's boarding hall, a young men's dormitory and gymnasium and a president's cottage. When fully equipped the plant represented a value of about $75,000. It has a commodious school building with three stories and a basement, erected in 1901; a young women's boarding hall, a young men's dormitory and gymnasium and a president's cottage. When fully equipped the plant represented a value of about $75,000. It is still owned by the State, but is now occupied under lease by the Weston High School and grammar grades.

Why should the voters of Oregon be asked to provide a $125,000 normal school plant at Pendleton when a $75,000 plant is already available at Weston, located but 21 miles from Pendleton in the same county?

It is significant that the Pendleton argument avoids all reference to this property. The Weston Normal was maintained until 1909, when because of certain adverse political influences and through no fault of its own it failed of an appropriation in the State Senate, although supported in the lower house by a vote of two to one. It was then the largest of three normal schools in the State, having an attendance of 278 in the normal department and a strong training school. Its work was accomplished on the modest maintenance of $12,500 per year. The Monmouth Normal now receives $39,000 per year, and in addition was granted $50,000 for buildings by the 28th legislative assembly. With similar support the Weston Normal would unquestionably have attained to at least equal rank and usefulness.

Through a bill initiated by the legislature the Weston Normal asked the people in 1914 for a maintenance tax of only one-fortieth of a mill, while Pendleton is now asking for one-twenty-fifth of a mill. Weston's request was denied by a majority of 17,895. In the same general election a similar millage tax for the support of the Ashland (Southern Oregon) Normal was defeated by a majority of 19,602.

In the face of this decisive adverse vote but two years ago the Pendleton measure we regard as a defiance of the people's mandate and an abuse of the initiative. Weston was content to wait for evidences of a change of sentiment in Oregon along normal school lines.

The Pendleton bill constitutes a return to "logrolling" methods. It clearly indicates the fear of its sponsors to go before the people on the merits of their own demand. Why seek to "validate" well established institutions that are in no sense in peril? Should the necessity ever arise, their security can and will be assured by the passage of a validating measure entirely independent of a millage tax for Pendleton's benefit. Pendleton has been treated generously in being granted the Eastern Oregon Hospital, which received a total appropriation of $308,659.25 from the 28th legislative assembly.

Normal schools are undoubtedly needed in Southern Oregon and in Eastern Oregon. The school at Weston should be supported. Weston is an attractive little city with adequate train service, beautiful surroundings, agreeable climate, healthful conditions and an ample gravity supply of pure mountain water. During the school's long career not one death ever occurred among its student body. Weston, in fact, is an admirable location for a state normal school. It is a "small town," yes; but so is Monmouth and so are numerous normal school towns in the East. Weston has in the past supplied an entirely adequate number of pupils for an efficient practice school, and can do so again.

Why should the voters expend $125,000 for something they already possess? Why should they tax themselves one-twenty-fifth of a mill when one-fourth of a mill—all that was asked of them and which they denied two years ago—is sufficient? Logic and economy alike suggest the defeat of the Pendleton bill, with a view to the ultimate reopening of the Eastern Oregon Normal at Weston.

F. D. WATTS
S. A. BARNES
E. O. DEMOSS
WM. MACKENZIE
CLARK WOOD.
Weston, Oregon.
the Voters of Oregon; General Election, November 7, 1916

(On Official Ballot, Nos. 310 and 311)

A MEASURE

To prohibit compulsory vaccination and medical treatment to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, proposed by initiative petition filed in the office of the Secretary of State, July 6, 1916.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed measure will be printed on the official ballot:

Initiative Bill—Proposed by Initiative Petition

Initiated by Lora C. Little. —ANTI-COMPULSORY VACCINATION BILL—

Purpose—To prohibit compulsory vaccination, inoculation and other such treatment for the prevention or cure of contagious or infectious diseases, and providing a penalty therefor. Vote YES or NO.

310 Yes.

311 No.

A BILL

For an Act to prohibit compulsory vaccination and medical treatment, and to provide a penalty for the violation thereof,

Be it Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

Section 1. That hereafter it shall be unlawful for any board of health, health officer, board of education, or any public officer or board, acting in this State under police regulations or otherwise, or any individual firm or corporation employing men, women or children, to compel by resolution, act, order, or proceedings of any kind, the vaccination of any person of any age, or the introduction of any serum or other so-called preventive or curative preparation, by inoculation or otherwise, into the body of any person of any age, for the alleged prevention or cure of any so-called contagious or infectious disease; or to make vaccination or the introduction of vaccine, serum or other so-called preventive preparation into the body of any person, a condition precedent to attendance, either as pupil or teacher, at any public or private school, college or institution of any kind, or to employment as employee, in any office, shop or factory, or by any railway company or other employing firm, individual or corporation of any kind.

Section 2. That any health officer, member of any board of health, board of education or any other public officer or member of any public board, or any member of any firm, or any officer, director, or agent of any corporation, or any individual violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50.00 nor more than $500.00, or by imprisonment in the penitentiary for not more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

For affirmative argument see page 30.
"Compulsory vaccination is an outrage and a gross interference with the liberty of the people in a land of freedom."—Daniel Webster.

This measure does not prohibit vaccination of any kind. It prohibits compulsory vaccination of all kinds. If passed, all desiring vaccination may have it. Those opposed to it will not be compelled to be vaccinated, as they now can be in some instances.

Vaccination for smallpox, now compulsory by law, is the inoculation of a human being with a substance called vaccine virus. This virus is produced in calves after the following manner:

The original or "seed" infection (pus) is taken from the sores of a smallpox patient. This inoculated into the calf gives it a fever; sores form, and from the sores on the calf comes the pus or scab which, after being mixed with glycerine, is injected into the human system.

Believers in vaccination claim it prevents smallpox. Its opponents, including many of the most reputable physicians, hold it does not. What is certain is that a great many persons have died from the effects of vaccination, and many others have been infected with loathsome and sometimes fatal disease by it. Hundreds of cases might be cited. Among the deaths occurring last autumn (1915) are these two in one family:

Frederick and Charles Perks, aged seven and five years, sons of Mrs. Perks, a graduate trained nurse, of Burlington, N.J., were vaccinated by Dr. John S. Conroy, the family physician. Both mother and doctor used every precaution, yet both children developed lockjaw. They were rushed to the Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, to secure medical aid. Both died in excruciating agony. Legal authority can put this poison into children. It cannot take it out.

Blood-poisoning, consumption, diphtheria, syphilis, cancer, lockjaw and other diseases are stated by eminent medical authorities to be the frequent fruits of vaccination.

It will be asserted that all vaccine sold in this country is inspected by government officials. Granted, but of what does their test consist? They try it out on guinea-pigs, which proves nothing. Children are not guinea-pigs. Even were the virus tested on human beings it would not be conclusive. Differences in individual constitutions must forever make vaccination highly uncertain and dangerous.

It will also be claimed that health board records show few if any deaths from vaccination. True, because it is not the custom to report original causes, but only immediate causes of death. For example, a death due to blood-poisoning (septicemia) from vaccination is certified as septicemia, with no mention of vaccination as the cause of the septicemia. It is the same with lockjaw and other fatal diseases produced by vaccination.

If space were available statistics might be quoted at length to show the inefficacy of vaccination to prevent smallpox in communities and countries where it has been rigorously enforced.

After forty-five years of trial, Great Britain repealed, in 1898, the compulsory feature of her vaccination law. Most of the cantons of Switzerland have done the same. In many of our own states it is a dead letter through non-enforcement. This is largely the case in rural Oregon. Where enforced in this State, school children and employees have been the chief sufferers, though among these a favored number always escape.

Vaccination is a medical theory over whose practice medical men are divided as to its efficacy. Should the State force upon a citizen a treatment of doubtful value but of undoubted danger?

Perhaps you believe in vaccination. That is your right. Your neighbor has an equal right not to believe in it. Voting "Yes" on this bill, you still hold your right to have vaccination if you want it, but you consent to making the law so that your neighbor cannot have vaccination forced upon him and his children against his will and best judgment; you keep your right and respect his.

The bill stands for simple justice; no more, no less. It deserves your support.

LORA C. LITTLE.
To repeal Section 2125, of Title XIX, of Lord's Oregon Laws to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, proposed by initiative petition filed in the office of the Secretary of State, July 6, 1916.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed measure will be printed on the official ballot:

**Initiative Bill—Proposed by Initiative Petition**

Initiated by Committee of Independent Retailers Association of Portland, Oregon, Dan Kellaher, President, 133 1/2 Grand Avenue, Portland, Oregon; Ben. A. Bellamy, Executive Committee, 401 Hawthorne Avenue, Portland, Oregon; S. S. Rich, Executive Committee, 267 Morrison Street, Portland, Oregon; C. E. Munro, Executive Committee, 248 Alder Street, Portland, Oregon; Leo R. Merrick, Executive Committee, Commercial Club Building, Portland, Oregon.—BILL REPEALING AND ABOLISHING THE SUNDAY CLOSING LAW—Purpose—To repeal section 2125, of Lord's Oregon Laws, which prohibits the keeping open of any store, shop, grocery, bowling alley, billiard room, or tippling house, for the purpose of labor or traffic, or any place of amusement on Sunday or the Lord's Day, excepting theaters, drug stores, doctor shops, undertakers, livery stables, butchers and bakers, under penalty of a fine of not less than $5 nor more than $50.

Vote YES or NO.

312 Yes.

313 No.

A BILL For

An Act to repeal Section 2125 of Title XIX of Lord's Oregon Laws as compiled and annotated by William Paine Lord, which prohibits keeping open any store, shop, grocery, bowling alley, billiard room, etc., for the purpose of labor or Traffic, or any place of amusement (except theaters), on the first day of the week, commonly called "Sunday."

Be it Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

Section 1. That Section 2125 of Title XIX of Lord's Oregon Laws (as compiled and annotated by William Paine Lord), be and the same is hereby repealed and abolished.

Section 2. That all Acts or parts of Acts in conflict with this Act are hereby abrogated, repealed and abolished in so far as they conflict herewith.

This Act is in all respects self executing and immediately operative.

For affirmative argument see pages 32-33.
Submitted by the Independent Retailers Association of Portland, Oregon, in behalf of Bill Repealing and Abolishing the Sunday Closing Law.

OLD BLUE LAW ORIGINALLY ENACTED

This Old Blue Law was enacted by the Legislature of Oregon in 1865, and has lain dormant and unenforced for practically fifty years. The citizens of Oregon paid no attention to it, and had apparently forgotten it, until resurrected, as it were, and its enforcement was sought last year, at Eugene, where self-inspired fanatics in ardent frenzied zeal enforced it and put the cigar and confection stands out of business on Sundays.

SPITWORK AND VENOM AT PORTLAND

Following this, at Portland, like visionary fanatical zealots, through sheer spitwork, employed stool-pigeons, who purchased a can of salmon or some cakes of milk, vegetables and confections, from grocers and others, and had them served with warrants and arrested for "keeping open for traffic on Sundays." Also, pool and billiard proprietors were arrested at Portland, for keeping open on Sundays; and wholesale arrests threatened against grocers, drugists, and other community accommodation stores proprietors, who have for years been supplying the public with its almost 300,000 people; and are now so entirely out-of-date, considering the automobile development, the out-of-doors enjoyment habits and customs of the people of Oregon on Sundays in rest and recreation delights, and considering the modern congested living conditions in large cities, the majority of which are without冷 storage facilities; so that fresh milk, for babies and children, fresh meats, and cooled canned milk and vegetables, and baked goods, are an absolute necessity on Sundays, a condition not existing in 1865 when this "Old Sunday Blue Law" was enacted.

JUDGE GANTENBEIN GRANTS INJUNCTION AGAINST ENFORCEMENT OF PRESENT SUNDAY LAW

Pursuant to the proposed repeal of this "Old Sunday Blue Law," an Initiative petition was started and circulated without cost by merchants and lovers of freedom, and Judge Gantenbein, of Multnomah County, granted an injunction against the enforcement of this "Old Sunday Blue Law," which is now so entirely out-of-date, considering the automobile development, the out-of-doors enjoyment habits and customs of the people of Oregon on Sundays in rest and recreation delights, and considering the modern congested living conditions in Portland and other large cities in Oregon, with so many people living in apartments, rooming houses, European hotels, flats, etc., in the densely populated districts, without ice and cool storage for keeping milk, meats and fresh fruits and vegetables, so that Sunday purchases of fresh foods of all kinds have become a modern growth civilization necessity, particularly in the cities.

WHY PUT OREGON PEOPLE IN A STRAIGHT-JACKET ON SUNDAYS?

The continuation of this "Old Blue Law," which will be enforced if not repealed, simply means putting the people of Oregon in a straight-jacket on Sundays. Do you wish to be hampered by such an antiquated law? We hope not. These visionary, frenzied, impractical schemers in their zeal have threatened to stop all Sunday amusements, under this present "Old Blue Law," which has been entirely out-of-date, giving the people of Oregon the number of hours, even though the Sunday Blue Law has not been enacted, as it is in every state.
the Voters of Oregon, General Election, November 7, 1916

Law." If not repealed, there will be absolutely no accommodations on Sundays, which should be a day of both rest and recreation, as well as enjoyment to all—giving the greatest good to the greatest number. And if not repealed this "Sunday Blue Law" will be enforced strictly, as it is now being done in Washington, Lane, Linn, and other counties in Oregon, where now you cannot purchase a newspaper, a cigar, or a lemonade or an ice cream cone, or gasoline, or anything else on Sunday.

CONTINUATION OF PRESENT SUNDAY BLUE LAW MEANS WHAT?

What does the continuation of this "Old Sunday Blue Law" mean to Oregon? If enforced, it means that all moving picture houses must stop on Sundays; it means that all pool and billiard parlors, and bowling alleys or other innocent exercising sports and recreations operated for pay or profit must not operate on Sundays; it means that Sunday newspapers cannot be printed, nor sold, nor delivered on Sundays; it means that all pleasure resorts and recreation delights of all kinds, including picnics, must cease on Sundays, if entrance fees or charges are made; it means that automobiles, sightseeing cars, river steamers, all picnics, football, golf, hunting and fishing, and sports, pleasures, and recreations of all kinds, which pay a fare, a charge, for carriage or entrance fee, must cease on Sundays.

Ice cream, confections, and foods of all kinds, and regular business of any kind, except just medicines, and medicines only, at drug stores, cannot be sold or delivered on Sundays. It means that you cannot get a shoe-shine, that you cannot buy a cigar, or candles for the kiddies, or cut flowers, on Sundays, unless you can prove them necessities or charities; and, you are liable to arrest each time, at the instance of some misguided zealot, or crank, who thinks he was put into the world as your guiding star, and wants you to do as he wants you to do, or go to jail. Is not that the situation?

OLD MARYLAND BLUE LAW FOR THE BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY

The Maryland Act of 1691, penalizing blasphemy and Sabbath desecration, provided: "For the first offense: offender shall be bored through the tongue and fined twenty pounds sterling; for the second offense: offender shall be stigmatized by burning in the forehead by the letter "B," and fined forty pounds sterling; and for the third offense: offender being convicted thereof, shall suffer death without benefit of the clergy." Connecticut and North Carolina had similar harsh laws, all the outgrowth of the Puritanical intolerance then abroad in the colonies.

Such a law is not in keeping with the broadening charitable teachings and spirit of this twentieth century golden rule civilization. The present Oregon "Sunday Blue Law" if continued in force, means that street cars and parks and amusements, where fares are paid or accepted cannot operate on Sundays. Sunday is now a day of rest, which everybody believes in; it should also be a day of enjoyment for innocent pleasures and recreations; but it cannot be a day of enjoyment if this old law is enforced as now threatened. Sunday automobilists and their friends, who are now legions, should repeal this unjust Sunday law. Its enforcement as threatened, means persecution as well as prosecution.

Listen to the Great Teacher: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." "Is it lawful on the Sabbath days to do good?" and "Therefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days."

VOTE YES AND REPEAL THIS OREGON "OLD SUNDAY BLUE LAW"

Vote Number 312 yes, and make Sunday a day of freedom, enjoyment, and pleasure, as well as a day of rest, allowing each individual to choose for himself.

INDEPENDENT RETAILERS ASSOCIATION OF PORTLAND,

By Dan Kellaher,
President of
Executive Committee.

Ben A. Bellamy,
Secretary-Treasurer
Executive Committee.
To the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, to amend Section 36, of Article I, proposed by initiative petition filed in the office of the Secretary of State, July 6, 1916.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed amendment will be printed on the official ballot:

Constitutional Amendment—Proposed by Initiative Petition

Initiated by Equal Rights for Home Industry Committee, C. E. S. Wood, Chairman, 254 Vista Avenue, Portland, Oregon; C. T. Haas, Secretary, 206 Stock Exchange Building, Portland, Oregon. PERMITTING MANUFACTURE AND REGULATED SALE FOUR PER CENT MALT LIQUORS—Purpose—To amend section 36, Article I, Oregon Constitution, which prohibits manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, by permitting the manufacture of fermented malt liquors containing four per cent or less of alcohol, for shipment outside of this state and for sale and delivery within the state by the manufacturer in original packages only, in quantities and under regulations which may be provided by law. Until otherwise provided such sales within the state shall be limited to the same quantity as may now be imported, but same persons cannot, within any one period fixed by law, both import and buy locally.

314 Yes.
315 No.

A BILL FOR

An Initiative law to amend Section thirty-six (36) of Article one (1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, so as to permit the manufacture of a light beer in the State of Oregon for export, also for sale within the state under such restrictions and regulations as may be provided by law or in the same quantity as now allowed to beer made outside the State. Giving to the home farmer, hop-grower and brewer, the identical legal privileges allowed to the outsider.

Be it Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon, That:

Section thirty-six (36) of Article one (1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon shall be and hereby is amended to read as follows:

Section 36. From and after January 1, 1916, no intoxicating liquors shall be manufactured or sold within this State, except for medicinal purposes, upon prescription of a licensed physician, or for scientific, sacramental or mechanical purposes; provided, however, that it shall be lawful to manufacture within this State, fermented malt liquors containing four per cent or less of alcohol, manufactured exclusively for shipment outside of this State; and provided further, that it shall be lawful to manufacture and sell and deliver in this State by the manufacturer to any person or individual, in original packages only, such fermented malt liquor, containing four per cent or less of alcohol, in such quantity or under such regulations as may be prescribed by law. Until otherwise prescribed by the legislature this right of sale and delivery shall be limited to the same quantity as persons are now permitted to import into the State under existing laws, and such persons may not within any one period fixed by law both import and purchase locally.

This section is self-executing and all provisions of the Constitution and the laws of this State and charters and ordinances of all cities, towns and other municipalities therein, in conflict with the provisions of this section, are hereby repealed.

For affirmative argument see pages 35-38.
Submitted by Equal Rights for Home Industry Committee in favor of proposed Constitutional Amendment Permitting Manufacture and Regulated Sale Four Per Cent Malt Liquors.

PRESENT LAW UNFAIR
Without entering into a discussion of the prohibition question itself, but mostly from an economic viewpoint, and believing that even from a prohibition point of view, there is lack of logic in our present constitutional amendment in allowing beer to be brought into the State from outside, yet forbidding the manufacture of this beer within the State; further believing the present prohibition law unfair in its discrimination against home industry and against the Oregon farmers, hop raisers and brewers, and being convinced that the Oregon voters, both male and female, believe in fair play and in the protection and promotion of home industry, the above amendment is presented to the public and is proposed by the undersigned committee.

GIVES OREGON SAME PRIVILEGES
If you feel that the Oregon farmer who raises hops and barley, and the Oregon brewer who has large investments in plants, etc., shall have the same privileges that are allowed out-of-the-State farmers and brewers, and if you think that it is an economic waste to have a pay-roll of many thousands of dollars per week lost to the State of Oregon, and to have thousands of dollars sent out of the State of Oregon almost daily for articles which could be produced from Oregon products in the State of Oregon, thereby giving employment to many men, keeping a large payroll in the State, and providing a favorable market for the hops and barley crops of our farmers, then we ask you to vote for this proposed amendment.

STRONG LIQUOR OR LIGHT BEER
A law which permits the consumption of strong liquor brought into the State from the outside, yet discriminates against even a light beer made in Oregon from Oregon barley and hops, is neither logical or just, and seems to answer no good purpose whatever. It is not even good temperance reform, because it inevitably encourages the importation of strong, spirituous liquors upon which transportation charges are low, and discourages the use of a light malt liquor, the transportation charge being high on account of its bulk.

WILL PROMOTE TRUE TEMPERANCE
By this amendment, the amount of alcohol permitted is not in excess of four per cent. This amount is practically as low as beer can be brewed and kept, and it is generally conceded that such a beverage is not a so-called "intoxicating liquor." Based upon the experiences of the great temperance reform made in Denmark, Sweden and Norway, and in use by Germany, the brewing of just such a light beer as here proposed, is encouraged by the government, and it is thought that this amendment will really promote both temperance and moral integrity.

IMMENSE LIQUOR IMPORTS
Do you know that the County of Multnomah alone, during the six months from January 1 to June 30, 1916, imported 41,628 shipments of liquor, and that the affidavits on file in the county clerk's office show that 43,583 persons, in addition, purchased raw alcohol from drug stores? With this condition in only one county of the State, it is easy to imagine what the complete figures would be if gathered.

ABOUT PATENT MEDICINES
Do you know that Dr. Menas S. Gregory, director of the psychopathic ward of Bellevue Hospital, New York, says in an interview in the New York Tribune, that "The American people spend $500,000,000.00 annually on patent medicines" most of
which contain more or less alcohol? It is estimated by the United States Internal Revenue Department that beer is manufactured in this country between three and four hundred of these so-called "tonics," "stomach bitters" and "nervines." Many of these have big sales in prohibition states and local option districts. Tribune says that according to labels in the possession of the Department of Agriculture at Washington, these patent medicines contain all the way from sixteen per cent to sixty-five per cent alcohol.

Peruna contains eighteen per cent alcohol; Lydia Pinkham's Vegetable Compound contains nineteen and five-hundredths per cent alcohol; Wine of Cardui contains thirty-three per cent alcohol; Hall's Great Discovery contains forty-three per cent alcohol; Hamlin's Remedy contains twenty-two per cent alcohol; Lydia Pinkham's Vegetable Compound, Wizard Oil contains sixty-five per cent alcohol.

Light Beer Beneficial

Do you know that in practically every so-called Prohibition state in the Union the percentage of patent medicines containing alcohol is very high, and steadily increasing? And how much would the present appalling consumption of raw alcohol, bought ostensibly for external use, be increased, and bootlegging be made still more profitable than it is now, if the legitimate importation or the home manufacture of a light beer were entirely prohibited. Conscientious citizens of the highest standing are prescribing beer for nursing mothers and for building up tissues in weak bodies. Is it therefore logical to pretend or to imagine that a light beer could be harmful to anyone, if it is prescribed for invalids and convalescents?

Largest Petition Ever Filed

This proposed amendment which you will either pass or defeat by your vote, is not a hastily gotten-together affair, but it is a carefully studied and matured plan of men and women of affairs and men and women of every walk in life who are sincere in their desire to bring about conditions in this State which will attain real reform of every kind. The further fact that the petition was signed by over 42,000 voters, men and women from all over the State, the circulation of the same having been done by voluntary work, indicates the overwhelming sentiment in favor of this proposed measure. It is larger by 7,000 than any petition ever presented to the Secretary of State, and therefore a splendid endorsement of the work of the high-minded men and women of the Committee who are deeply interested and concerned in this constructive work toward the moral as well as financial improvement of their State. It is proposed, not by any one connected with any liquor industry whatsoever, but is vouched for by high-minded, responsible business men, whose names are known to many of the voters throughout the State, and in order to fortify your opinion as to the standing in the community of the men and women who ask you to vote for this law, and in order to satisfy yourself that it is not a movement to reestablish saloons, we ask you to carefully read the names of the undersigned committee, who will not stand for any trifling with the expressed will of the people.

Hop-growers Vitaly Interested

The hop-growers' interest in this proposed amendment is shown by the following letter received by the secretary of this committee:

"Salem, Oregon, July 14, 1916.

"Mr. C. T. Haas, Secretary,

"'Equal Rights Home Industry Committee.'

"Dear Sir: Realizing the importance to the State at large and to the Hop-Growers in particular of the measure proposed by your committee, abolishing the present unjust discrimination against home industry and Oregon farmers and being firmly convinced that the voters of the State will remedy this condition if properly informed of the facts and of its importance to the farmer and hop-raiser I beg to submit the following facts in the hope that they will be of use to you:

"Since the beginning of the hop industry in Oregon, over $55,000,000.00 has been returned to local growers. In the year 1914 alone over $6,000,000.00 was added to the income of the State from this industry and some 50,000 men and women participated in the income through employment offered them in picking the crop.

"Through hard and consistent work Oregon has gradually climbed to the lead in the hop industry of the United States; this supremacy will, however, never be possible, unless present conditions are changed. We are placed in the ludicrous position of asking out-of-the-State brewers to purchase our hops when we ourselves prohibit Oregon brewers from using them, although permitting the use and importation of beer made in other states. This not only results in taking away our local markets for our crops but has also resulted in outside brewers declaring a sort of 'boycott' against Oregon hops. In the hop-growers' interest in this proposed measure.

"What then will become of the many thousands of acres now in hops? What becomes of the many more of thousands of our citizens who depend solely upon this industry for their means of livelihood?"
"It is asserted by those who are in a position to know that the hop industry is one of the State's greatest resources and means of assets, not only in bringing money into the State but also in providing employment. "Is it just or fair to wipe out such an asset? We feel sure that if the voter will give your measure honest and just consideration that Oregon's hop industry will be saved.

"Yours very truly,

OREGON HOP-GROWERS ASSOCIATION;
"By J. L. Clark, Manager."

AMENDMENT GENERALLY ENDORSED

This argument is submitted on behalf of the General Committee whose names are printed below, by the Chairman and Secretary of said Committee, and strongly endorsed by leading farmers and hop-growers.

GENERAL COMMITTEE
A. L. Mills, President First National Bank, Portland, Oregon.
Theo. B. Wilson, President Portland Flouring Mills, Portland, Oregon.
Wm. D. Wheelwright, President Pacific Export Co., Portland, Oregon.
Wm. Haney, Farmer, Burns, Oregon.
W. S. U'Ren, Attorney, Oregon City, Oregon.
Elliott Corbett, Banker, Portland, Oregon.
Joseph Simon, Attorney and former U. S. Senator, Portland, Oregon.
Josephine Hirsch, Portland, Oregon.
Ben Selling, Merchant, Portland, Oregon.
Chas. F. Berg, Merchant, Portland, Oregon.
Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, Portland, Oregon.
S. Benson, Capitalist, Portland, Oregon.
E. E. Coover, Attorney, Portland, Oregon.
J. B. Yeon, Capitalist, Portland, Oregon.
J. C. Alsworth, President U. S. National Bank, Portland, Oregon.
John M. Gairn, Attorney and former U. S. Senator, Portland, Oregon.
Eugene Smith, Labor Representative, Portland, Oregon.
J. P. Plagemann, Merchant, Portland, Oregon.
Frank Kiernan, Capitalist, Portland, Oregon.
William B. Peckhelmer, Capitalist, Portland, Oregon.

E. W. Rockey, Physician and Surgeon, Portland, Oregon.
M. Sichel, Merchant, Portland, Oregon.
William Albers, Albers Bros, Manufacturers, Portland, Oregon.
William Mackenzie, Stationary Engineers, Portland, Oregon.
Fred Heese, Manufacturer, Portland, Oregon.
Frank E. Watkins, Real Estate, Portland, Oregon.
Frederick V. Holman, Attorney, Portland, Oregon.
George F. Holman, Attorney, Portland, Oregon.
Geo. F. Price, Pacific Title & Trust Company, Portland, Oregon.
M. L. Jones, President Oregon Hop Growers' Association, Brooks, Oregon.
P. Lowengart, Merchant, Portland, Oregon.
J. G. Mack, Merchant, Portland, Oregon.
Henry Itahn, Merchant, Portland, Oregon.
David N. Mossesohn, Lawyer and Publisher, Portland, Oregon.
A. B. Steinbach, Merchant, Portland, Oregon.
L. Gerlinger, Motor Cars, Portland, Oregon.
David M. Duane, Merchant, Portland, Oregon.
Wm. C. Bristol, Attorney, Portland, Oregon.
Ernest F. Tucker, Physician and Surgeon, Portland, Oregon.
C. P. Bishop, State Senator and Member of Senate Alcoholic Committee, 1915 Session, Salem, Oregon.
J. R. Linn, Grain Broker, former State Senator, Salem, Oregon.
J. L. Stockton, Merchant, Salem, Oregon.
Hal D. Patton, Merchant and State Senator, Salem, Oregon.
W. F. Osburn, Proprietor Osburn Hotel, Eugene, Oregon.
G. W. Griffin, Merchant, Eugene, Oregon.
R. S. Smith, Attorney, Eugene, Oregon.
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Wm. Pollman, President Baker Loan & Trust Co., and First National Bank, Baker, Oregon.
John Schmitz, Banker, Baker, Oregon.
Guson Neuberger, Merchant, Baker, Oregon.
Dr. C. E. Barton, Baker, Oregon.
Carl Adler, Merchant, Baker, Oregon.
S. L. Baer, Banker, Baker, Oregon.
M. Dilsheimer, Merchant, Baker, Oregon.
Fred G. Holmes, President LaGrande National Bank, La Grande, Oregon.
Pat Foley, Hotelman, La Grande, Oregon.
J. H. Peare, Merchant, La Grande, Oregon.
J. L. Henry, Merchant, La Grande, Oregon.
V. Palmer, Lumberman, La Grande, Oregon.
Frank C. Branwell, U. S. Land Office Register, Baker, Oregon.
W. E. Brock, President Pendleton Commercial Bank, Pendleton, Oregon.
E. W. McComas, Millman, Pendleton, Oregon.
Horace Walker, Pendleton, Oregon.
W. L. Thompson, President American National Bank, Pendleton, Oregon.
E. J. Sommerville, Cattleman, Pendleton, Oregon.
Max Vogt, President First National Bank, The Dalles, Oregon.
A. McCoy, Millman, The Dalles, Oregon.
B. King, President Dry Fish Co., The Dalles, Oregon.
A. E. Walther, Merchant, The Dalles, Oregon.
E. M. Williams, Merchant, The Dalles, Oregon.
W. J. Weaver, Hotel Umpqua, Roseburg, Oregon.

John W. Oliver, Hotel Grand, Roseburg, Oregon.
Simon Caro, Merchant, Roseburg, Oregon.
A. Creason, Capitalist, Roseburg, Oregon.
J. W. Perkins, Capitalist, Roseburg, Oregon.
Albert Abraham, Roseburg, Oregon.
Henry Hart, Physician and Capitalist, Medford, Oregon.
H. Withington, Attorney, Medford, Oregon.
Emil Mohr, Medford Hotel, Medford, Oregon.
Dr. J. M. Keene, Medford, Oregon.
H. L. Truax, Grants Pass, Oregon.
Dr. M. H. Flanagan, Grants Pass, Oregon.
R. C. Dunlap, Hotel Josephine, Grants Pass, Oregon.
Frank Patton, Banker, Astoria, Oregon.
C. F. Guenther, Astoria, Oregon.
C. G. Palmberg, Astoria, Oregon.
Chas. A. Larsen, Astoria, Oregon.
P. A. Stokes, Astoria, Oregon.
B. Van Dusen, Astoria, Oregon.
J. Bremmer, Astoria, Oregon.
Edw. C. Judd, Astoria, Oregon.
S. S. Gordon, Astoria, Oregon.
Chas. V. Brown, Astoria, Oregon.
W. C. Logan, Astoria, Oregon.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO HOME INDUSTRY COMMITTEE.

C. E. S. Wood,
Chairman, Yeon Bldg., Portland, Oregon.

C. T. Haas,
Secretary, Stock Exchange Bldg., Portland, Oregon.
AN AMENDMENT

To the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, to amend Section 36, of Article I, proposed by initiative petition filed in the office of the Secretary of State, July 6, 1916.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed amendment will be printed on the official ballot:

Constitutional Amendment—Proposed by Initiative Petition

Initiated by Oregon Prohibition State Committee, J. P. Newell, Chairman, 822 Spalding Building, Portland, Oregon; J. Sanger Fox, Executive Secretary, 414 Behnke-Walker Building, Portland, Oregon.—PROHIBITION AMENDMENT FORBIDDING IMPORTATION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS FOR BEVERAGE PURPOSES—Purpose—This is a constitutional amendment extending the existing constitutional provision, relating to the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, by also prohibiting the importation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. Vote YES or NO.

316 Yes.
317 No.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Section 36 of Article I of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, relating to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, shall be, and hereby is, amended by adding thereto the following paragraph, which shall be known as Section 36a:

Section 36a. No intoxicating liquors shall be imported into this State for beverage purposes.

This section is self-executing, and all provisions of the Constitution and laws of this State and of the charters and ordinances of all cities, towns and other municipalities therein, in conflict with the provisions of this section, are hereby repealed.

For affirmative argument see page 40.
The amendment adopted by popular vote in 1914 prohibits the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. The law passed by the Legislature in 1915 permits the importation under certain restrictions. This permission has been the subject of much criticism. The people have never passed on it and should be given the opportunity to do so.

The amendment forbidding importation should be adopted for several reasons:

1. The ease with which liquors may be imported into prohibition states has always been one of the chief obstacles to the enforcement of prohibitory laws. The rapid increase of importations indicates that the experience of Oregon will not be different from that of other states.

2. The present law is undemocratic in its working. People of wealth can obtain liquor with little trouble, but the opportunity is not so readily available to the man of average means.

3. The money spent for liquor is all taken out of the State, and in its place we receive only that which injures the community.

4. The passage of this amendment is the most effective rebuke to the impudent attempt of the brewers to restore the saloon under the guise of solicitude for the commercial interests of the State.

OREGON PROHIBITION STATE COMMITTEE,

J. P. Newell, Chairman.

J. Sanger Fox, Executive Secretary.
AN AMENDMENT

To the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, by the addition of Article XIa thereto, proposed by initiative petition filed in the office of the Secretary of State, July 6, 1916.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed amendment will be printed on the official ballot:

Constitutional Amendment—Proposed by Initiative Petition

Initiated by the Oregon Referendum League: C. E. Spence, Master Oregon State Grange, Oregon City, Oregon; J. D. Brown, President, Oregon-Southern-Idaho Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union, Arlington, Oregon; T. H. Burchard, Ex-President Oregon State Federation of Labor, 829 East Eleventh Street North, Portland, Oregon.—RURAL CREDITS AMENDMENT—Purpose—To bond state for not over two per cent of assessed valuation of all property therein for "Rural Credits Fund." Bonds from $25.00 to $1000 in series of $50,000, maturing in not over 36 years, interest four per cent, exempt from taxes. State to loan said Fund to owners occupying farm lands, on mortgages not over half land value nor $50 per acre, nor less than $200 nor more than $5600 to one person, small loans preferred. Loans made for: (a) payment for land; (b) purchasing livestock and equipment and making improvements; (c) satisfying incumbrances incurred for such purposes; interest five per cent.

Vote YES or NO.

318 Yes.

319 No.

The Constitution of the State of Oregon is hereby amended by the addition of Article XIa, to read as follows:

ARTICLE XIa

Section 1. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in Section 7 of Article XI of this Constitution, the credit of the State may be loaned and indebtedness incurred to an amount not exceeding two per cent of the assessed valuation of all the property in the State for the purpose of providing funds to be loaned upon the security of farm lands within the State, subject to the limitations herein contained.

Sec. 2. The Governor, Secretary of State, and State Treasurer shall constitute the State Land Board, which Board is hereby authorized and directed to issue and sell or pledge bonds in the name of the State to be known as Oregon Farm Credit Bonds in an amount not to exceed said two per cent of the assessed valuation of all the property in the State, and to place the proceeds in the State Treasury in a fund to be known as the "Rural Credits Loan Fund."

Sec. 3. Said bonds shall be issued in denominations of $25, $100, $500 and $1000, and shall be issued in series of $50,000, or multiples thereof, drawn to mature in not more than thirty-six years. They shall bear interest at the rate of four per cent per annum and shall be exempt from all taxes levied by the State of Oregon, or any of its subdivisions.

Sec. 4. Said State Land Board is authorized and directed to loan the moneys in said Rural Credits Loan Fund to owners of farm lands in Oregon upon notes secured by mortgages or deeds of trust constituting first liens on such farm lands in amounts which shall not exceed fifty per cent of the value of such lands, or $50 per acre on such lands, nor less than $200 nor more than $5000 to any individual. Preference shall be given to loans not exceeding $2000 in amount.

Sec. 5. Such loans shall not be made except to owners who operate and occupy the lands mortgaged, and shall be made only for the following purposes: (a) The payment for lands purchased; (b) the
purchase of livestock and other equipment, and the making of improvements which, in the judgment of said Board, will increase the productivity of such lands or add to their value as a farm home in a degree to justify such expenditure; and (c) for the satisfaction of encumbrances upon such lands which, in the judgment of said Board, were incurred or assumed by said applicant for the aforesaid purposes.

Sec. 6. Every applicant for a farm loan shall state clearly in his application the purposes for which such loan is desired, and upon its approval by the Board, this statement shall be deemed a part of the note or contract under which the loan is granted. But no failure to apply such funds to the purposes stated in such application or enumerated herein shall invalidate a loan when once made, nor shall anything herein contained be deemed to prevent any farm owner from selling or leasing lands subject to such encumbrance; but if he shall violate his said contract by applying the moneys borrowed to purposes other than those stated in his application or enumerated herein, or if he shall lease such lands or sell them to any person not fulfilling the conditions and purposes provided for herein, said Board is authorized and directed to require the repayment of said loan upon six months' notice, and said note or contract shall contain a clause providing therefor.

Sec. 7. Such loans shall be repaid with interest accruing in semi-annual or annual installments on the amortization plan, such installments being fixed at such sums as will cover the interest rate and will liquidate the debt in a period to be agreed on between said Board and the applicant, such period to be not less than ten nor more than thirty-six years; but any debtor may liquidate any part or all of his indebtedness in amounts of $50 or multiples thereof upon any amortization payment date.

Sec. 8. The rate of interest on loans shall be five per cent per annum, provided that in case any series of said Farm Credit Bonds is sold at an average of less than par, the Board may charge upon such farm loans as are made from the proceeds of the series so sold below par a rate of interest in excess of five per cent, but which shall not exceed by more than one per cent the rate which the State must pay for the funds actually obtained from the disposal of its said bonds. The Board, however, shall require each applicant to pay an initial charge of 1 per cent of the loan granted, the minimum charge to be $10, to cover the cost of appraisal and examination of title.

Sec. 9. All surplus funds accruing from the operation of the system of rural credits herein provided for, after paying interest accruing on the aforesaid bonds and all operating and other expenses arising from the administration of said system of rural credits, shall be placed in the State Treasury and become a part of a fund to be known as the "Rural Credits Reserve Fund." Said Rural Credits Reserve Fund shall be loaned on farm lands in the manner herein provided for the Rural Credits Loan Fund, and the interest accruing from loans made from said Rural Credits Reserve Fund shall be added to it and become part of it. The said Rural Credits Reserve Fund shall be irreducible except that it may be drawn upon to reimburse the State for loss incurred in the administration of said system of rural credits.

Sec. 10. The Legislative Assembly shall provide in such detail as it shall deem advisable for the carrying out and administering of the provisions of this amendment and shall provide adequate safeguards against the use of such loans as an aid to the purchasing and holding of lands for purposes of speculation. Such safeguards shall include clear definitions of the terms "operate" and "occupy" used herein. In the absence of such legislation, and subject to the same after its enactment, the State Land Board shall proceed to administer said system of rural credit under rules and regulations provided by itself, but subject to the provisions herein contained.

Sec. 11. The provisions of the Constitution and laws of Oregon in conflict with this amendment are hereby repealed insofar only as they conflict herewith. The provisions of this amendment shall be self-executing, and shall take effect and be in operation 60 days after their approval and adoption by the people of Oregon.

For affirmative argument see page 43.
ARGUMENT FOR RURAL CREDITS AMENDMENT

Practically every other civilized country has established a system of credit suited to agriculture. Such systems have everywhere brought rural prosperity and greater national strength and stability.

Agriculture is the basic industry of Oregon. If our farmers are prosperous, every legitimate business and industry will share in that prosperity.

But our farmers are now far from prosperous. We have been enticing people into the State who find that they cannot make wages on the farms in which they have sunk their savings. Hundreds are ruined every year by the foreclosure of mortgages bearing exhorbitant interest rates.

The farm debt of Oregon, secured by real and chattel mortgages is conservatively estimated at $30,000,000. On this debt the farmers are paying an average rate of about 9 1/2% interest. Added to this the costs of renewal and commissions, the rate paid is probably little under 9 3/4%.

It is the purpose of the Rural Credits Amendment to take the burden out of the farm mortgage incubus of the State. It proposes to give the farmer 36 years in which he may pay off his mortgage. The rate of interest will be 5%. The cost of title searching and appraisal will be from $10 to $50 according to the amount of the loan. The farmer must pay off 1% of the original sum borrowed each year. That is, the payment of 6% a year on the mortgage will pay interest, cost of operation and wipe out the debt entirely in a period of 36 years. The farmer who so desires, however, may pay off any part or his entire debt at any time.

What will this system mean to the State? In the first place it will mean an annual saving in interest and mortgage costs of $750,000 a year. But this is not all. It means an end to the perpetual worry and expense of mortgage renewing; it means practically an end to foreclosures, lost homes and blighted hopes; it means better equipped farms and greater rural prosperity. This means more business for railroads, factories and stores and more work for laborers in our cities.

The system is inexpensive. The State can borrow money at lower interest than any of its subdivisions or any individual. It proposes to confer this advantage upon the borrower without risk or cost to the State. The system is simple and direct, getting the money to the farmer without paying tribute to expensive middle-men. The cost of operation in loaning the state school funds is only 2/10 of 1% and this system will be handled in much the same way by the State Land Board.

The system is safe. The State Land Board has not lost a penny in the past 5 years in loaning the $6,000,000 of school funds, and little or nothing has been lost in the past 20 years. The borrower foots all the bills so that the tax-payer is not affected in any way.

Denmark, Ireland, 6 Australian States and New Zealand have had almost identical laws for periods ranging from 10 to 22 years. Their losses have been negligible and the benefits have exceeded expectations.

Do not be deceived. The agents of eastern loan and trust companies and insurance companies who are bleeding Oregon agriculture to the extent of $750,000 a year in needlessly excessive interest rates, will leave no stone unturned to defeat this bill. They will use all sorts of arguments and many agencies to voice them. Be prepared for them and never forget that their motive is to keep Oregon farmers in bondage.

Respectfully submitted,

The Oregon Referendum League

C. E. SPENCE,
Master Oregon State Grange, Oregon City, Oregon.

J. D. BROWN,
President Oregon-Southern-Idaho Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union, Arlington, Oregon.

T. H. BURCHARD,
Ex-President Oregon State Federation of Labor, 829 East Eleventh St. N., Portland, Oregon.

Committee in Charge.
AN AMENDMENT

To the Constitution of the State of Oregon to be submitted to the legal electors of the State of Oregon for their approval or rejection at the regular general election to be held November 7, 1916, to amend Article XI by adding a section thereto to be designated as Section 11, of Article XI, proposed by initiative petition filed in the office of the Secretary of State, July 6, 1916.

The following is the form and number in which the proposed amendment will be printed on the official ballot:

Constitutional Amendment—Proposed by Initiative Petition

Initiated by State Tax Payers' League, Walter M. Pierce, President, La Grande, Oregon; C. L. Hawley, Vice-President, McCoy, Oregon; J. A. Westerlund, Vice-President, Medford, Oregon; A. M. LaFollett, Vice-President, Salem, Oregon; Robt. E. Smith, Secretary-Treasurer, Roseburg, Oregon.—STATE-WIDE TAX AND INDEBTEDNESS LIMITATION AMENDMENT—Purpose—Limiting tax levies of State, County, municipality or other taxing power to not more than the total amount levied the last preceding year plus six per centum thereof, except for paying bonded indebtedness and interest thereon, or by vote of people, any increase so voted excluded in determining subsequent tax; limiting power of counties to incur indebtedness to $5000, either voluntarily or when imposed by law, except to suppress insurrection or repel invasion, or not over two per cent of assessed valuation for permanent roads on vote of people; and invalidating debts, payments and taxes exceeding such limitations. Vote YES or NO.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

Article XI of the Constitution of the State of Oregon shall be and hereby is amended by adding thereto the following section which shall be designated as Section 11 of Article XI:

Section 11. Unless specifically authorized by a majority of the legal voters voting upon the question neither the State nor any county, municipality, district or body to which the power to levy a tax shall have been delegated shall in any year so exercise that power as to raise a greater amount of revenue for purposes other than the payment of bonded indebtedness or interest thereon than the total amount levied by it in the year immediately preceding for purposes other than the payment of bonded indebtedness or interest thereon plus six per centum thereof, provided whenever any new county, municipality or other taxing district shall be created and shall include in whole or in part property theretofore included in another county, like municipality or other taxing district, no greater amount of taxes shall be levied in the first year by either the old or the new county, municipality or other taxing district upon any property included therein than the amount levied thereon in the preceding year by the county, municipality or district in which it was then included plus six per centum thereof, provided, further, that the amount of any increase in levy specifically authorized by the legal voters of the state, or of a county, municipality, or other district, shall be excluded in determining the amount of taxes which may be levied in any subsequent year.

The prohibition against the creation of debts by counties prescribed in section 10 of article XI of this constitution shall apply and extend to debts hereafter created in the performance of any duties or obligations imposed upon counties by the constitution or laws of the State, and any indebtedness created by any county in violation of such prohibition and any warrants for or other evidences of any such indebtedness and any part of any levy of taxes made by the state or any county, municipality, or other taxing district or body which shall exceed the limitations fixed hereby shall be void.

For affirmative argument see page 45.
ARGUMENT (Affirmative)

Submitted by State Tax-Payers League in behalf of proposed State-Wide Tax and Indebtedness Limitation Amendment.

Are taxes in Oregon high enough? Shall we limit their further increase to 6% a year? These are the questions you must ask yourself in considering the State-Wide Tax Limitation Amendment.

Oregon's per-capita tax is higher than that of any other state in the Union. During the past ten years taxes have increased 37% a year. Taxes have increased five times faster than population.

As a result Oregon has been going steadily backward in population and wealth for the past three years. Last year seven families left the State to each new family coming into it. In the face of these discouraging conditions there are those who have plans which will result in still greater increases in our taxes. Unless a limit is provided the Legislature and our public officials will continue to increase our taxes as rapidly as they have in the past.

The purpose of the "State Wide Tax Limit Amendment" is to limit the increase in taxation to an annual increase not to exceed 6% a year unless a greater increase is authorized by the people. In other words if a man's taxes are $100 this year they can't be more than $106 next year unless the greater increase is authorized by the people. It means that Oregon can continue to spend all the money she is now expending and can increase it 6% a year; but if our public officials wish to increase it at a faster rate they must get the authority of the voters.

If you feel that your taxes are high enough now and that they should not increase faster than 6% a year in the future unless the voters authorize a greater increase you will support this measure.

STATE TAX-PAYERS LEAGUE,
By Robt. E. Smith,
Sec'y.
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initiated by the Secretary of the Senate
Signed by the Governor
Approved by the Secretary of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted</th>
<th>To the</th>
<th>Yes.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initiated by the Assembly
Approved by the Governor
This Is the Way the Proposed Constitutional Amendments and Measures Will Appear on the Official Ballot

NOTE.—The following list of ballot titles and numbers has been compiled for the convenience of the voters, so that if desired they may prepare in advance marked lists of all measures in order to expedite the marking of their ballots while at the polls.—SECRETARY OF STATE.

Referred to the People by the Legislative Assembly

Submitted by the Legislature.—SINGLE ITEM VETO AMENDMENT—An amendment to Section 15 of Article V of the Constitution of the State of Oregon authorizing the Governor to veto single items in appropriation bills. Vote YES or NO.

300 Yes.
301 No.

Submitted by the Legislature.—SHIP TAX EXEMPTION AMENDMENT—An amendment to Article IX of the Constitution of the State of Oregon exempting from taxation until January 1st, 1935, except taxes for State purposes only, all ships and vessels of fifty tons or more capacity, engaged in either passenger or freight coastal or foreign trade, whose home ports of registration are in the State of Oregon, for the purpose of encouraging registration of such vessels in Oregon, which would otherwise register in other states. Vote YES or NO.

302 Yes.
303 No.

Submitted by the Legislature.—NEGRO AND MULATTO SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT—An amendment to the Constitution of the State of Oregon, removing the discrimination against negro and mulatto citizens by repealing Section 6 of Article II thereof, which section reads as follows: "No negro, Chinaman or mulatto shall have the right of suffrage." Vote YES or NO.

304 Yes.
305 No.

Proposed by Initiative Petition

Initiated by Oregon State Federation of Labor, T. H. Burcharld, President; E. J. Stack, Secretary, 362- Oregonia Building, Portland, Oregon; and the Central Labor Council of Portland and vicinity, Eugene E. Smith, President; A. W. Jones, Vice-President; E. J. Stack, Secretary, 162½ Second Street, Portland, Oregon.—FULL RENTAL VALUE LAND TAX AND HOMEMAKERS' LOAN FUND AMENDMENT—Purpose—a constitutional amendment declaring and defining (a) people's power and right; (b) citizen's right to use of land; (c) public ownership of land rent; (d) public policy of Oregon; defining (e) the word "land"; (f) method of appraising land rent; (g) land improvement; providing for (h) levy of permanent land rent tax; (i) publication of assessment; (j) delinquent tax sale; (k) maintenance of private property rights; (l) separate assessment of land rent; (m) standing timber; (n) assessment and collection of tax; (o) duty of Governor and State Land Board; (p) how personal property and land improvements may be taxed by vote of people only; (q) distribution of revenue from land rent tax; and (r) establishing homemakers' loan fund. Vote YES or NO.

306 Yes.
307 No.

Initiated by the Commercial Association of the City of Pendleton W. E. Brock, President; C. K. Cranston, Secretary.—FOR PENDLETON NORMAL SCHOOL AND RATIFYING LOCATION CERTAIN STATE INSTITUTIONS—Purpose—To provide for locating a State Normal School at Pendleton, Oregon, upon a site to be donated therefor, appropriating $125,000 for buildings and equipment and levying an annual tax of one twenty-fifth of a mill on all property in the state for its maintenance, and ratifying the location of certain state institutions heretofore located away from the State Capital. Vote YES or NO.

308 Yes.
309 No.

Initiated by Lora C. Little.—ANTI-COMPULSORY VACCINATION BILL—Purpose—to prohibit compulsory vaccination, inoculation and other such treatment for the prevention or care of contagious or infectious diseases, and providing a penalty therefor. Vote YES or NO.

310 Yes.
311 No.
Initiated by Committee of Independent Retailers Association of Portland, Oregon; Dan Kellaher, President, 1834 Grand Avenue, Portland, Oregon; Ben A. Bellamy, Executive Committee, 401 Hawthorne Avenue, Portland, Oregon; S. S. Rich, Executive Committee, 267 Morrison Street, Portland, Oregon; C. B. Mann, Executive Committee, Commercial Club Building, Portland, Oregon.—BILL REPEALING AND ABOLISHING THE SUNDAY CLOSING LAW.—Purpose.—To repeal Section 2125 of Lord's Oregon Laws, which prohibits the keeping open of any store, shop, grocery, bowling alley, billiard room, or tipping house, for the purpose of labor or traffic, or any place of amusement on Sunday or the Lord's Day, excepting theaters, drug stores, doctor shops, undertakers, livery stables, butchers and bakers, under penalty of a fine of not less than $5 nor more than $50.

312 Yes.
313 No.

Vote YES or NO.

Initiated by Equal Rights for Home Industry Committee, C. E. S. Wood, Chairman, 254 Vista Avenue, Portland, Oregon; C. T. Haas, Secretary, 206 Stock Exchange Building, Portland, Oregon.—PERMITTING MANUFACTURE AND REGULATED SALE FOUR PER CENT MALT LIQUORS.—Purpose.—To amend Section 36, Article I, Oregon Constitution, which prohibits manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, by permitting the manufacture of fermented malt liquors containing not more than four per cent or less of alcohol, for shipment outside of this state and for sale and delivery within the state by the manufacturer in original packages only, in quantities and under regulations which may be provided by law. Until otherwise provided such sales within the state shall be limited to the same quantity as may now be imported, but same persons cannot, within any one period fixed by law, both import and buy locally.

314 Yes.
315 No.

Vote YES or NO.

Initiated by Oregon Prohibition State Committee, J. P. Newell, Chairman, 822 Spalding Building, Portland, Oregon; J. Sanger Fox, Executive Secretary, 414 Behinke-Walker Building, Portland, Oregon.—PROHIBITION AMENDMENT FORBIDDING IMPORTATION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS FOR BEVERAGE PURPOSES.—Purpose.—This is a constitutional amendment extending the existing constitutional provision, relating to the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor, by also prohibiting the importation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

316 Yes.
317 No.

Vote YES or NO.

Initiated by the Oregon Referendum League: C. E. Spence, Master Oregon State Grange, Oregon City, Oregon; J. D. Brown, President, Oregon-Southern-Idaho Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union, Arlington, Oregon; T. H. Burchard, President, Oregon State Federation of Labor, 828 East Eleventh Street South, Portland, Oregon.—RURAL CREDITS AMENDMENT.—Purpose.—To bond state for not over two per cent of assessed valuation of all property therein for "Rural Credits Fund." Bonds from $25.00 to $1000 in series of $50,000, maturing in not over 36 years, interest four per cent, exempt from taxes. State to loan said fund to owners occupying farm lands, on mortgages not over half land value nor $50 per acre, nor less than $200 nor more than $5000 to one person, small loans preferred. Loans made for: (a) payment for land; (b) purchasing livestock and equipment and making improvements; (c) satisfying incumbrances incurred for such purposes; interest five per cent.

318 Yes.
319 No.

Vote YES or NO.

Initiated by State Tax Payers' League, Walter M. Pierce, President, La Grande, Oregon; C. L. Hawley, Vice-President, McCoy, Oregon; J. A. Westerlund, Vice-President, Medford, Oregon; A. M. LaFollett, Vice-President, Salem, Oregon; Robt. E. Smith, Secretary-Treasurer, Roseburg, Oregon.—STATE-WIDE TAX AND INDEBTEDNESS LIMITATION AMENDMENT.—Purpose.—Limiting tax levies of State, County, municipality or other taxing power to not more than the total amount levied the last preceding year plus six per centum thereof, except for paying bonded indebtedness and interest thereon, or by vote of people, any increase so voted excluded in determining subsequent tax; limiting power of counties to incur Indebtedness to $5000, either voluntarily or when imposed by law, except to suppress insurrection or repel invasion, or not over two per cent of assessed value for permanent roads on vote of people; and invalidating debts, payments and taxes exceeding such limitations.

320 Yes.
321 No.

Vote YES or NO.